

THE  
RELIGIOUS MAGAZINE  
AND  
MONTHLY REVIEW.

---

VOL. XLVI. — SEPTEMBER, 1871. — No. 3.

---

THE PROPOSED REVISION OF THE NEW  
TESTAMENT.

BY HENRY F. JENKS.

It has long been felt by scholars, and even by ordinary readers, that a revision of the Bible was desirable. Many plain errors ought to be corrected, some acknowledged interpolations to be no longer retained, while not a few obscure passages would be made clear by an amended translation.

Since but a small proportion of those who look to the Scriptures as the guide of life can read them in the tongues in which they were originally written, it is important that the translation to which they are confined should reproduce the original as nearly as the differences of language will allow. Our version of the Scriptures has always been characterized by this fidelity, but to maintain that it is so far perfect as to be susceptible of no improvement is to be willfully blind to the progress of scholarship for two centuries and a half, and to ignore the fruits of laborious and critical research.

Mr. George P. Marsh, in an article in "The Nation,"\* says, "In purity and beauty of style it is the first of English classics, and its diction and special grammatical structure are appropriate to the matter in a degree of which modern literature offers no other example. The revision of such a translation can have but two legitimate aims — first, the correction of errors arising from the adoption of a corrupt original text by the translators, or from a mistaken interpretation of the text; and, secondly, the substitution of more appropriate words or forms of expression for terms and phrases which are now wholly obsolete and unintelligible to the ordinary reader, or which, through changes in the language and in the tone of social culture, have become inexplicable, or suggestive of low or revolting images or associations, offensive to the sound taste and the moral sense of the present age.

The question of revision, which has been for many years discussed, is no longer an open one, for, on the 10th of February, 1870, both houses of the Convocation of Canterbury passed a resolution, offered by the Bishop of Winchester, "to report upon the desirableness of a revision of the authorized version of the Old and New Testaments, whether by marginal notes or otherwise, in all those passages where plain and clear errors, whether in the Hebrew or Greek text originally adopted by the translators, or in the translations made from the same, shall on due investigation be found to exist."

This resolution was seconded by the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol (Ellicott), who has taken considerable interest in the subject, and has recently issued a little work † on the revision of the New Testament. The prominent position which he occupies upon the committee appointed under this resolution renders it highly probable that his views of the manner in which the work should be done will largely

---

\* The Proposed Review of the English Bible. Three articles by G. P. M. (Hon. George P. Marsh), in *The New-York Nation* for Oct. 13, 20, and 27, 1870.

† Considerations on the Revision of the English Version of the New Testament. By C. J. Ellicott, D.D., Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol. London: Longmans, Green, Reader, and Dyer. 1870.

guide those to whom it is committed; and so his opinions become quite important, and have a general interest. We shall find his suggestions wise, though cautious, and that he has a spirit of reverent conservatism, and perhaps of timidity, joined to the student's desire for correctness.

He gives a very interesting history of our Bible, in which he shows how greatly it is indebted for its vigor of language, felicity of expression, and fidelity of rendering, to the labors of Tyndale. But since our Bible received its present form, the indefatigable labors of students have largely increased our knowledge of its originals. Old manuscripts have been discovered, and a careful comparison of them has given us "a very accurate knowledge of what were probably the very words which were either traced by the hands of the Apostles and Evangelists or dictated by them to the faithful writer" (p. 37). The "mother text" of our version (the fourth edition of Erasmus's Testament) "was based on scanty evidence and late manuscripts," our facilities for improving it are very great, and we ought carefully to use every help which the present state of criticism offers towards the right understanding of the original. "If there are errors they ought to be removed for the truth's sake. If there are inaccuracies which give false tinges to deduced doctrines, surely we seem called upon to revise them now, whatever may be done in the future, in accordance with the known and, for the most part, fixed principles of grammar and scholarship."

Mr. T. K. Abbott, Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Dublin, has issued a strong plea for the revision of the English Bible,\* in which he says that the present version is only one of a number of revisions, for in no other country has there ever been so many revisions. That many trust the Bible as infallible is a reason for making it correct. "In this country" (England, and how much more strongly is

---

\* The English Bible and our duty with regard to it. A Plea for Revision. By Thomas Kingsmill Abbott, M.A., Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Dublin. Dublin. 1871.

it the case in America), he says, "it has established an absolutely exclusive authority, being regarded almost as an original. . . . It has become the sole ultimate appeal of millions both of our own and other branches of the human family, and the numbers of those who thus look up to it are multiplying daily. Is this a reason for acquiescing in its imperfections? Does it not, on the contrary, make it more and more imperative to remove every spot, in order that our version may reflect its original as clearly, as faithfully and as thoroughly as human skill with the divine help can effect? Yes, and that it be done speedily, for every delay, as it makes the necessity more pressing, renders the obstacles more formidable."

Some may be *offended*, in the English sense of the word, he thinks, by a revision, but an adherence to erroneous readings offends in the Biblical sense; and he adds that a careful revision of the prophetic books of the Old Testament would throw light on places now dark, and in not a few instances give beauty and poetry instead of confusion; and, finally, a revision which should, as far as can be, put the English reader in possession of the very words of the inspired writers without impairing the beauty of the English Bible, would be a glorious work.

"If we knowingly teach," he says, "what we have good reason to believe false, we cannot plead devout ignorance in our defense."

It is not a new translation that is proposed at the present time, but simply a revision of the old, and even that is not now to be attempted for the first time; but hitherto we have been indebted for all endeavors to improve the received version to individual scholars, whose labors have necessarily borne marks of the peculiar bias which led them to their task, as well as of their special views and judgments; while now the work is to be done upon a broader basis; and in the communion of many minds, and the comparison of different views, it is hoped that results will be reached worthy of general acceptance. A revision must be the work of many persons,



frequently consulting together, and comparing conclusions around a common table.

The Bishop discusses at some length the critical state of the New Testament ; the general character of the authorized version, and the principles on which it was constructed ; the limits to which revision should be confined ; the number of corrections that would be introduced ; and the objections to revision, whether at any time, or only at the present. In some respects, we think, while agreeing with him in the main, his suggestions are not entirely judicious, while in others he is inconsistent with himself. The scholar seeking truth is at times restrained by the conservatism of the prelate wedded to an established system, and bound by traditional theories of inspiration.

He well says, that, in order to have any revision generally acceptable, the vocabulary of translation must be limited to that of the authorized version ; the principles of the revision of 1611 must be adhered to ; the frequently modifying power of the context must be recognized ; the translation of particles and tenses attended to ; and the fact kept in mind that the tenses in Greek and English, particularly the past tenses, are not co-extensive ; there must be a sensitiveness to the rhythm and cadence of the authorized version ; and, finally, a remembrance that a translation must commend itself to the simple hearer as well as the cultivated scholar.

Prof. Lightfoot\* thinks that the reviser's hand could be employed to advantage on the English of our version. He thinks there is no disposition to alter its character, "but while its stately rhythm and archaic coloring are sacred to English-speaking people the version addresses itself to plain folk. So long, then, as an archaism is intelligible, let it stay ; if it is misleading, or ambiguous, or inarticulate, the time for removing it has come."

---

\* On a Fresh Revision of the English New Testament. By J. B. Lightfoot, D.D., Canon of St. Paul's, and Hulsean Professor of Divinity, Cambridge. London. 1871.

Bishop Ellicott says (p. 213), "The revised version must be a popular version; it must also be a version that reads well, and can be heard with the old and familiar pleasure with which our present version is always listened to; it must, thirdly, be such that no consciousness of novelty of turn or expression is awakened in the mind of hearer or reader. . . . Such a result can only be obtained by making the correction in words chosen out of (so to speak) a strictly Biblical vocabulary, and also by the mechanical, but very necessary proceeding, of having each chapter, when completed, read aloud, slowly and continuously, by one of the body of Revisers to his assembled brethren. Many a correction which the eye and inward feeling might have been willing to accept will be beneficially challenged by the simple and subtle process of the hearing of the outward ear."

Mr. Marsh says decidedly that the first duty of the revisers is to settle the text to be translated from, and the exegesis of that text; and Bishop Ellicott discusses at some length "whether to construct a critical text first, or to use preferentially, though not exclusively, some current text, or to proceed onward with the work of revision whether of text or translation, making the current *Textus Receptus* the standard, and departing from it only when critical or grammatical considerations show that it is clearly necessary" (p. 30).

The labors of Griesbach, of Tischendorf, of Lachmann, of Tregelles, not to mention others, the discovery of new manuscripts, including the celebrated Sinaitic, and the improved means of access to old ones, would have been in vain if by them our store of critical material was not made largely superior to that possessed by the scholars of King James's reign. We are not so blind as not to appreciate the wealth of our materials; the great question is, how can they be best and most judiciously employed?

We are disposed to agree with the opinion of Marsh, already quoted, rather than with that of Ellicott. It seems to us important that some one text, the best attainable, should be selected as a basis for revision, and that the various read-

ings should be indicated in the margin or elsewhere. There may be objections, as Ellicott claims, against any and every individual text, but these might be obviated by the course which Lightfoot has followed in his valuable commentaries on Galatians and Philippians, of preparing a text expressly for the purpose.

The Bishop acknowledges the indebtedness of students to the investigations of Tischendorf, but disposes of him by calling him this most inconstant and restless critic, whose "inconstancy is to be attributed to a natural want of sobriety of critical judgment, and to an unreasonable deference to the readings as found in his own *Codex Sinaiticus*," and asking which of his editions should be selected in preference to the others.

The text of Lachmann he considers more a critical revision than a critical text, which the author himself would hardly have judged a suitable text to form the basis of a popular revised version.

The work of Tregelles is unsatisfactory because the earlier part was prepared without the assistance of the Sinaitic manuscript (for yielding too much deference to which he condemns Tischendorf); because his critical principles are called in question by many competent scholars; and, finally, because in some parts he approaches so nearly to the text of Lachmann that the same objections which would apply to one are equally forcible in regard to the other.

"Let us then," he says (p. 45), "have no *Textus Receptus*, at any rate at present, but proceed, as good sense seems to indicate, tentatively, and be content to wait." By this course he thinks that the remaining passages concerning which there is still any considerable doubt will be reduced indefinitely, but this result cannot be reached unless revision is actually begun. He would leave the received text as the standard, departing from it in every case where the necessity of a change is pointed out by critical evidence, and the consent of the best editions.

"Such a text would not be, nor deserve to be, esteemed a strictly critical text: it would be often too conservative; it

would also be occasionally inconsistent ; but if thus formed by a body of competent scholars it would be a critical revision of a very high and probably very popular character. It would at any rate be free from one great disturbing element in all critical labors, — individual bias and personal predilections" (p. 49).

We do not feel the full force of the Bishop's reasoning. To our mind some of the objections which he lightly passes by seem of the gravest character. Within the limits he himself allows, this course would virtually be the formation of a new text ; and when we think of the dangerous probability of inconsistencies in the text from this method of procedure, we fail to see any compensating advantage to be derived from it. Moreover, it strikes us that there is a little disingenuousness in the proposition. The text thus made will not be the *best possible*, but the best that it is believed public sentiment will allow. The idea of making a *popular* text rises above that of making a *correct* one. Instead of instructing and forming popular sentiment, it is proposed to be guided by it. This seems to us derogatory to sound critical scholarship.

We think it should be the very first business of the revisers to settle upon a text as a standard and guide, even if in doing so it becomes necessary for them to reach decisions upon some still open questions, and not wait till we "gravitate by a natural process to a general consent." It is true that placing a word in the text is a "virtual judgment in its favor, in many cases of a final character ;" but if the work is to be done thoroughly, either that judgment should be pronounced now, even at the risk of future reversal, or we should confess that we are, as yet, unable to make a satisfactory revision. Certainly in cases where there appears to be a fairly defined consent between critics and commentators in regard to the true reading, in opposition to that in the received text, it seems as if the change might safely be made.

We are next to consider within what limits revision is desirable, and the probable number of changes which it would introduce. The need of revision has been supposed

to be the number of changes which would be necessary; the Bishop endeavors to overcome the objections to it by showing how few would be required. His extreme limit, based on a somewhat rough estimate, is "one change in every four verses due to textual criticism, and about one change in each verse due to grammar and general exegesis."

Prof. Lightfoot thinks there is no reasonable ground for apprehension as to the extent and character of the changes which may be introduced. The regulations under which the new company of revisers will act are a sufficient guarantee against hasty and capricious change. Individual revisers are not to have the opportunity to introduce their favorite crotchets. The danger is rather that the changes introduced will be too slight to satisfy the legitimate demands of theology and scholarship than that they will be so sweeping as to affect the character of our English Bible.

In the examples which the Bishop gives, the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. v. to vii. inclusive) and Romans v. to viii. inclusive, two hundred and nineteen verses, he makes thirty changes from critical considerations, and about two hundred and twenty-six from grammatical and other reasons, divided between the two passages as follows: in the one hundred and eleven verses of the Sermon on the Mount nineteen changes due to textual considerations, and about fifty-six to grammar and exegesis; and in the one hundred and eight verses of the passage from Romans eleven textual changes and one hundred and seventy grammatical.

These examples of revision are well done, but in them we cannot help thinking that we see both the value of the Bishop's rules, and the truth of his general remarks about the danger of intrusting to individuals the work of revision. He allows that he may not have observed entirely his own rules, and we cannot but think that if his revision were read before the whole body of revisers many of his changes would be pronounced unadvisable, if not unnecessary, and some would be suggested which he has not noticed. He seems, at times, to have fallen into the error to which every individual translator is liable, of substituting a new word for an old and familiar one

because it appears at the time to bring out a shade of meaning more forcibly, or to be a more exact rendering, when a reconsideration, or the candid criticism of independent minds, would show that for all practical purposes the old form might have been retained.\*

With all his readiness to make unimportant changes, the Bishop displays a strong conservatism in an almost undue sensitiveness to changes which affect, even remotely, doctrinal questions, where the change, authorized or advocated by scholars of repute, seems to be in opposition to the tenets in which he was educated, and of which he is an official guardian and exponent. This sensitiveness, though natural, cannot be too zealously guarded against by the revisers.†

We are pleased, however, to meet confessions as candid as the following: "Suppose it be true, though even this we do not concede, that there is no obvious error in our version, whether in the text or in the translation, affecting any distinct definition of doctrine, yet can any one, with the most moderate knowledge of theology, undertake to deny that a great number of current deductions, commonly made and commonly accepted, affecting such vital doctrines as the doctrine of personal salvation, and the doctrine of the last things — what is technically called soteriology and eschatology — rest upon mistranslations of words, and misconceptions in

---

\* Some of these points seem quite trivial, e.g., we see no advantage in the transposition from "therefore when" to "when therefore," or in the substitution of "due season" for "due time," in spite of the Bishop's earnest argument, or "howbeit" for "nay," or "what I perform" for "that which I do," or "weakness" for "infirmities," which latter, if we must lose to give the number correctly, would be expressed equally satisfactorily to most persons by its own singular; but after these examples we should have expected that the Bishop would have substituted "created thing" for "creature," instead of telling us in a note that the change would make the meaning more plain, but is, perhaps, not necessary.

† The late Dr. Noyes furnishes an admirable example for the revisers to imitate in his love of truth and candor of scholarship, which never allowed him to hesitate in rendering a passage as he believed the truth required, even if thus the death-blow was dealt to his own opinions.

exegesis, which might be greatly reduced, if not wholly removed, by a fair and scholarly revision" (p. 190); and this: "The truth is often unpalatable, and we fear it may be so in this case, but the fact is certain,—some extreme views, especially in reference to some deeper doctrines, would lose some amount of the support which they now find in the translated words of the English version of the New Testament, if those words were fairly reconsidered by impartial and competent scholars" (p. 191).

Revision is extremely desirable where the same Greek word occurring in different places has been rendered by different English words. The unlettered reader ought not to be subjected to the danger of being misled by the carelessness or design of the translator. "No plea for freedom," says Bishop Ellicott (p. 118), "can fully justify us in retaining all the seventeen different readings of *καταργέω*, when the word itself is only used about twenty-seven times in all, or the nine different renderings of *ζήλω* out of a total of twelve passages." For further illustrations of this practice he refers his reader to the Englishman's Greek Concordance of the New Testament.

The Bishop gives various illustrations of his views upon the extent of revision, which we shall do well to notice. First, all passages containing plain error, concerning which no competent scholar would doubt, should be unhesitatingly corrected. Of this class he instances a few passages, of which we select one, Rom. v. 15, 17: "Where the neglect of the articles in the original has not only obscured the sense and weakened the antithesis, but has left an opening for inferences on redemption and reprobation, which, to say the least, are not substantiated by this passage."

Of the next class are errors of less importance, by whose existence neither Christian life or practice are in the slightest degree affected (e.g., *δυνάμεις* in Matt. xxiii. 24). "As far as the general reader is concerned, the true or the erroneous reading might nearly equally well hold its place in the English text; and this remark is often used as an argument for leaving things alone. But . . . if the removal of errors



would so little affect the general reader, surely it is all the more the duty of faithfulness to the message of inspiration to transmit it to the English hearer free from incorrectness and error on pure principle" (p. 103).

In regard to other corrections, the Bishop says tact must be the great guide. Such cases are those where English synonyms have been too freely used for the same Greek word and similar context; where the force of the article has been missed; where the shades of meaning of the tenses of the original are needlessly lost sight of; where there is inaccuracy in the translations of prepositions, or in passages of some doctrinal importance. All these should be corrected with care, subject to the rules already mentioned.

The Bishop gives examples of changes in the genitive of quality which do not seem to us, in all cases, improvements. In Phil. iii. 21, "the body of our vileness," and "the body of His glory," do not seem to be preferred to the phrases, "our vile body," and "His glorious body," with which our ear is so familiar. In some instances our version has substituted the noun for the adjective to great advantage, and there may be good reasons for bringing all the instances under the same rule, but then we must give up the "unjust steward," for the "steward of injustice." We must, therefore, either trust to the decision of good taste in individual cases, or realize that the adoption of an arbitrary rule will necessitate the sacrifice of some familiar phrases as a lesser evil for a greater good.

The same remarks will perhaps apply to the endeavor to give the force of the Greek tenses in English; or to mark with distinctness the manifold shades of meaning which the Greek expresses so forcibly by prepositions with their genitives; or to note the nice connections of thought and relations of time which are given by different adverbs.

Prof. Lightfoot in his work on Revision, which in many respects is more satisfactory than Bishop Ellicott's, showing as it does the desire of the scholar without being hampered by the fears of the prelate, says, "Many changes should be made in our English version which can easily be done with-



out altering its character, for instance, the substitution of an amended for a faulty text; the removal of artificial distinctions not existing in the Greek; the restoration of old distinctions which, being in the Greek, were overlooked by the translators, the correction of errors of grammar and lexicography; the revision of proper names and technical terms; the removal of a few archaisms, ambiguities and faults of expression, as well as inaccuracies of editorship."

"A careful comparison of any book of the New Testament," he adds, "with any recent critical edition of the Greek text will show that the faults of our version are far from being few, or slight and imaginary."

There is so much diversity of sentiment as to the need and the limits of revision that the revisers must touch their work with a cautious hand if they would ensure its reception, not introducing any very sweeping changes, and erring on the side of conservatism rather than of rash and hasty change; but their task must be thoroughly performed, and so "thoroughly idiomatic, so completely in harmony with the abiding character of the language, that it will remain intelligible and expressive, and therefore need no new revision for a long period of time." \*

"It must be remembered," says the Bishop, "that to countless thousands the English Bible is the Book of Life. To them it is as though God had vouchsafed thus to communicate with man from the first; it is a positive effort for them to feel and believe that the familiar words, as they meet the eye or fall on the ear, did not thus for the first time issue from

---

\* We fear that we cannot hope much for the general reception of the new revision, if the manner in which the first specimen of it which has reached us through the papers has been received be regarded as a fair test of public sentiment. In the Lord's Prayer, we are told, the phrase, "Deliver us from evil," has been rendered, "Deliver us from the Evil One." This is directly opposite to the advice of Ellicott, and to the specimen in his book; for he, while recognizing the essential correctness of the alteration, yet feels that the familiar language of this prayer is so endeared to the hearts of men, that the attempt to introduce a change so serious would greatly endanger the success of the revision.

the lips of patriarch or prophet; nay, that the touching cadences in the Gospels were not originally so modulated by the tender and sympathizing voice of our own adorable Master. . . . Are we to have no sympathy for this large class? Is there not something in the heart affection for the 'dear old English Bible' that deserves the respect even of the scholar and the theologian? Childlike faith is very blessed; let us run the risk of being called sentimental or quixotic rather than needlessly offend one of these little ones that thus believe in His word and in Him" (p. 104).

The work of revision should be done by men the character of whose scholarship is so well established that it will give authority to their recommendations. A committee of Divines, Bishops, and Presbyters of the Established Church, with authority to add to itself scholars of other communions, has been appointed and is already engaged upon its labors. If its work is approved and adopted by the Church of England it will stand a great chance of supplanting our present version in the churches of the world.

It is to be hoped that the liberty of adding to its number, and thus securing the co-operation of the most eminent Biblical scholars, will be used by the committee. Let the candor and learning of the revisers be above suspicion, and the world will ask few questions concerning the particular religious opinions of individual members of the body. In men of broad scholarship love of truth will necessarily rise superior to adherence to speculative views of doctrine, and the correct rendering of a passage be esteemed of more importance than the substantiation of a dogma.

Lightfoot regards as an auspicious circumstance the liberality shown in inviting the co-operation of Biblical scholars outside the Anglican communion, and their prompt and cheerful acceptance of the invitation, and thinks it a matter of great thankfulness, giving a guarantee that the work is undertaken, not with any narrow, sectarian aim, but in the broad interests of truth.

Mr. Marsh well says that there is no good reason why Biblical students of every tongue and of every creed may not

aid in settling the text of an authority which all equally recognize. But he condemns the present proposed revision, "as a purely sectarian, not to say schismatic movement, and as such calculated to widen rather than narrow the divisions which exist between the different Protestant churches of English speech, and as being evidently a half measure, aiming at no thorough work which shall establish the readings of the original text and of the English Bible on a reasonably satisfactory and permanent basis." Finally, he says, "The interests of Christian harmony require that the labor be inaugurated under the most catholic auspices, and that the composition of the board of revisers, and the principles upon which the revision is to be conducted, shall furnish every guaranty that the task shall be executed with all possible learning, all possible discretion, all possible fairness, charity, and candor." He says, "We find no such guarantees in the plan before us."\*

To these charges, severe as they are, we must in candor confess, the Bishop's book does seem to lend plausibility and coloring. It is not fair, however, not to give him an opportunity to be heard in reply. He says, "Reverence for God's Word and God's truth, and sound and practical scholarship, will be found too strong even for religious prejudices, if, indeed they are to be considered as likely to be shown by men of disciplined minds in matters of English and Hellenic grammar and criticism. Again and again must the general reader be reminded of the great difference between a commentary and a revision. The former work could not be executed by such a mixed body as is now under consideration; the latter certainly could, because the appeal would lie in all cases to

---

\* Mr. Marsh's fears have been fully justified by the attempt of the Bishops to expel Rev. Vance Smith, the Unitarian member of the Revision Committee, from his position as a member of the New Testament company. For an account of this proceeding the reader is referred to an abstract of the debate in both houses of Convocation in "The Monthly Religious Magazine" for April. It is pleasant, however, to add that wiser counsels prevailed, through the influence of Dean Stanley, and that Mr. Smith is still acting as a member of the committee.

scholarship ; and here, thank God, there is neither High Church nor Low Church, neither Conformity nor Dissent. If the mass of general readers could once be persuaded of this simple fact, — that the more accurate the scholarship the more tolerant and charitable are men found to be when in co-operation, we should hear far less gloomy anticipations of the animosities and ruptures that we are told would show themselves in a mixed body of scholars of differing religious persuasions. But those who indulge in such anticipations are not scholars, and have never done an hour's work of revision in co-operation with others" (p. 198).

Much that has been said of the need of revision, and the principles on which it should be conducted, apply as forcibly to the Old Testament as to the New. It is to be hoped that at least this may be undertaken at once, and accomplished as speedily as possible, since it is to be feared that in the growing disregard of Hebrew learning by students and theologians, we shall at no future time be more competent to perform it than we are now, while the time may even come when the circle of readers of the Old Testament in the original shall be narrowed to as small a compass as is that of its translation into the Indian tongue by the apostle Eliot.

Prof. Lightfoot thinks well of the prospects of success for revision if undertaken at the present time. Greek scholarship has never stood higher in England than now. There is a sufficient body of scholars to undertake the work, and a large body fully competent to criticise minutely and searchingly the result. Moreover, there is reason to fear that Greek scholarship has reached its height in England, and is hereafter to decline before the demand of other branches of learning, particularly scientific studies, for a place in general education, which, if yielded to, will render the almost exclusive dominion of classical studies a thing of the past.

---

HONOR yourself and you will be honored ; despise yourself and you will be despised.

## AN EVENING HYMN.

FROM THE GERMAN OF GOTTFRIED KINKEL.

Now all is hushed to stillness,  
The evening breezes die,  
And everywhere one heareth  
Angelic feet go by.  
Upon the vale descending,  
The darkness draweth near, —  
Cast off, O heart, thy sorrow,  
And banish all thy fear !

Now rests the world in silence,  
Its 'wilderer tumult o'er,  
Its songs of joy, its wailings  
Of anguish heard no more.  
And has it brought thee roses,  
Or bade new thorns appear, —  
Cast off, O heart, thy sorrow,  
And banish all thy fear !

And if to-day some errors  
Or failings have been thine,  
Oh, look not back ! Rejoice thou  
In proffered grace divine !  
On high, the Shepherd, watching,  
Holds e'en his stray ones dear, —  
Cast off, O heart, thy sorrow,  
And banish all thy fear !

Majestic, in the heavens,  
Now stands the starry train ;  
In destined course unswerving  
Moves on the golden wain ;  
And like the stars above thee,  
Through night He guides thee here, —  
Cast off, O heart, thy sorrow,  
And banish all thy fear !

S. C. R.

## THE ELEVATION OF THE LABORING CLASSES.

BY THE EDITOR.

How to make physical labor productive, and how to secure to the laborer himself a liberal portion of the proceeds of his labor, are problems which involve many of the most difficult and weighty questions connected with our modern civilization. The common way of talking on this subject seems to us very superficial and unsatisfactory. Under a free government, it is said, and with free institutions like ours, the son of a laboring man may be a great merchant, lawyer, or statesman, and therefore the laboring man should be satisfied with his position. This may be very well for the son of one man in five hundred or of one man in one hundred. But what of the ninety and nine who are left behind? The important problem is not, how to educate the children of laboring men so as to enable one in a hundred or one in fifty to rise successfully into a more eligible position, leaving his associates where they were, but how to lift up the laboring classes themselves into a more eligible position,—not how to make the condition of manual labor “an excellent state to emigrate from,” but how to make it an excellent state to remain in,—how to lift it up into a higher plane of civilization and so endow it with opportunities and privileges, and with moral aims and forces, that within its own province all the great ends of life may be sought after and secured.

In every well organized nation, nine-tenths or more of the people belong to the laboring classes. They *are* the people. Their elevation and prosperity are the elevation and prosperity of the people. In other lands and times, the policy of governments has been to keep down the laboring classes. Kings had rights. A few privileged classes had rights. But the great laboring classes had no rights, except the right to work for their superiors and be submissive to them. Our people have been educated to a different doctrine. But even

here, where all stand apparently on the same equality, the process of emancipation has been a slow one. The old doctrine of kingly and priestly authority, resting nominally on a divine right,—king or priest, not for the good of any man, but by the grace of God,—justified itself on the ground of the helpless and hopeless ignorance of the masses; and in order to maintain this assumption, it condemned them to labors so incessant, and to a poverty so abject, as to confirm them in their ignorance, and take out of their hearts all hope of bettering their condition. And now after so many centuries of oppression, the great experiment is still going on, and it is yet to be proved that a democratic government, i.e., “the government of the people, for the people, and by the people,” is a possible thing. For such a government can be inaugurated and carried on successfully only by the intellectual and moral elevation of what are called the laboring classes.

In order to render this intellectual and moral elevation possible, two things are essential to the laborer.

I. His wages should be such as to provide liberally for his physical wants and comforts, and enable him in youth and health to lay aside something from his earnings so that gradually, without ceasing to be a laborer, he may also become a capitalist.

II. His wages should be such, that, after this provision for his immediate and prospective physical wants and comforts, he may be able to educate his children, and have time, strength and means for his own intellectual, moral and religious culture, and for the exercise, in his own sphere, of some of the finer tastes, and the more liberal sentiments and habits, which take away from the bareness of domestic life, enlarge the mind and heart, and promote a generous public spirit.

Formerly it was impossible to secure these conditions. Wealth and the means of obtaining wealth were indeed unequally and unjustly distributed. But apart from that, long-continued, incessant, exhausting labor was needed to supply the physical necessities of men, and a very few of the comforts of life. The higher faculties had no room for expan-

sion, but were bound down, straightened and benumbed by the perpetual routine of wearisome, unremitted toil. With the laboring classes, there was little time or strength left for higher pursuits. Now and then a bright boy was singled out from his companions and put to school, and thus separated from the class in which he was born. But excessive toil, accompanied by weariness, exhaustion, and the low habits and tastes growing out of it, was the common lot. Comfortless homes were the uninviting abodes of people who were almost of necessity ignorant, brutal, vicious. All this because of the degrading influence of unbroken servile toil! Till the end of the last century, this was the condition of the laboring millions in almost every European country. In our own land, a virgin soil, the peculiarities of our institutions, and our isolated position gave us great advantages. But even here it was very hard for laboring men as a class to do much more than provide for their bodily wants.

Then began a new era for laboring men. By improvements in the useful arts and sciences, by the application of steam—the power loom and spinning jenny, the railroad, the sewing machine, and a thousand lesser inventions of a similar sort,—there has been an immense saving of labor. In many mechanical pursuits these improvements have been such, that all the necessities, comforts, and luxuries which could formerly be secured by working fourteen hours a day, may now be procured by working two hours a day, and the labor which is now employed ten hours a day will produce five times as much as the same amount of labor could formerly produce when employed fourteen hours a day.

If the increased products are divided as they formerly were, between capitalists and laborers, the laboring man who works eight hours a day should be four times as well off as his grandfather was, who seventy years ago worked fourteen hours a day. We may reduce our estimates one-half, and bring them far below the facts in the case. On this supposition, he who works eight hours a day now ought from the proceeds of his labor to be twice as well off as was his grandfather, laboring fourteen hours a day.



Now do we not see the immense opportunities which the invention of labor-saving machines is laying open, or ought to be laying open, to the laboring classes, enabling them to increase at once their wealth and their leisure from bodily toil, giving them time for intellectual improvement, and time and means to cultivate and gratify their higher tastes? Fewer hours of labor, and the earnings of those fewer hours, four or five times as great as before!

There is no exaggeration in this statement, so far as regards the productiveness of labor-saving machines, or so far as regards what ought to be the productiveness of labor to every industrious, hard-working man. The advantages indicated by the statement may not yet have been fully secured. Great allowances for loss by waste or friction are always to be made when we come to deduce from a theoretical truth its practical results. Still, in the simple statement that we have made respecting the increased productiveness of labor, there is involved a fact, which, followed through all its legitimate bearings, *is, and ought to be, working out in our social condition changes which in the end can be regarded as hardly less than a stupendous social revolution.*

The hard exactions caused by the necessities of life have hitherto prevented the possibility of a free government. Athens and Rome were said to have free governments. But the free citizens of Athens or of Rome, who alone had the privilege of voting, and any part in the administration of public affairs, were a very small minority. The fierce democracy that we hear so much of in Athens was in fact a small and privileged order. By far the largest class of all—the men and women who by bodily labor provided for all the rest—were slaves. The labor necessary to provide for the physical wants of the people condemned the laboring classes to a wearing and degrading servitude even under what professed to be a free government. And practically what we call a popular or free government was thus rendered impossible.

But this impossibility, so far as our own physical wants are concerned, has now been removed. The inventions of the last seventy years, followed up as they must be by other

inventions of a similar kind, have prepared the way for the emancipation of the laboring classes from the grinding servitude of incessant toil. One hour's labor now produces as much as six hours' labor could do seventy years ago. Instead of six, however, we will call it four. That is enough, rightly applied, to emancipate the laboring classes from what, in its extreme severity, could hardly be otherwise than a degrading and servile occupation. The way is opened. The laboring classes who have been the bone and sinew, and who ought to be, also, in no small measure, the heart and moral power of the land, have only to be faithful to their opportunities, and they will hold a position, exercise an influence, enjoy advantages, and fulfill a destiny, vastly beyond what was ever possible to them before.

Agriculturalists are those who have been the least benefited by labor-saving machines. The high prices of labor among mechanics can hardly be afforded by farmers, and their occupation is still more depressed in New England by the competition into which they have been brought with the exceedingly fertile lands of the west. A consequence of this is that a large proportion of our enterprising young farmers enter into other occupations, or go where more fertile lands will better reward their labor. It is plain, therefore, that New England is to become principally a manufacturing country, the farmers to be sustained mainly by the near and ready market furnished in manufacturing villages for such products as cannot be brought from great distances — the more bulky articles, such as hay, potatoes, and apples, or the more perishable articles, such as garden fruits and vegetables.

But to return to the problem before us. The great advance in the productiveness of labor has been working a revolution in society. If it has increased the profits of the capitalist beyond all previous experience, it has also increased the privileges, opportunities, and pecuniary resources of laboring people. The hours of labor have been reduced twenty, thirty, or forty per cent., and wages have been increased two, three, or even four hundred per cent. The poor girl who formerly could earn but fifty cents may now earn four or five

dollars a week, an increase in pay of six hundred, eight hundred, or a thousand per cent.

The social and industrial revolution which has been going on has in no respect exercised a more beneficent influence than in the emancipation which it has been working out for woman. Fifty years ago, fifty cents a week was the price usually paid to a woman for doing house-work, and for teaching one of our common public schools in a country town. Twelve weeks of hard work in a school — and at the end of that time an accomplished woman receiving in return for her whole summer's labor, six dollars! We have changed all that — in part. We have increased the pay of woman. We have enlarged and are enlarging still more the field of her activity. Many occupations formerly closed are now opened to her. We rejoice in every indication that we see of this kind. Where a woman does a man's work as well as a man, we can see no just reason why she should not have a man's pay. The old Common Law, which looked upon woman as inferior to man, and which therefore placed a noble woman entirely at the mercy of her husband however unworthy he might be, giving her as against him no rights which he was bound to respect, allowing him to appropriate her earnings and consume them even upon his vices, had no foundation in justice, and has, in these parts at least, been set aside. With the grand examples that we have known of womanly intelligence and virtue, of womanly grace and fortitude, of womanly powers of thought and action, he must be a very bold or a very unscrupulous man who declares that woman is inferior to man. But if not unequal, they are unlike. Many fields of labor they may occupy together. For some employments, her finer organization, her more delicate perceptions and sensibilities peculiarly fit her. We cannot think that men are as well fitted as women for the nursery, and for the almost divine office of training young children through the most impressible period of life. We should be glad to have women admitted, first as pupils, and then as teachers, into our highest schools and colleges, and to some of the liberal professions. I remember hearing an eminent lawyer once say in

regard to religious services which he had just heard, that if the husband could only have gone into the nursery and the wife into the pulpit it would have been a great advantage to the church. But how would it have been in the nursery? It would be a great wrong and injury to our religion and an offence against God and man to close the mouths of women like Elizabeth Fry and Lucretia Mott, and confine them to their private duties. But we should be very sorry to see women engaged in the heaviest labors of the farm or the blacksmith's shop, or enlisting in the army or navy to endure the hardships and exposures of war. Until the world is a great deal better than it now is, we do not think that women can engage in the worse exposures and conflicts of political life, without suffering more in the feminine delicacy and tenderness and the charm and power of womanly authority, than they will gain by political position or efficiency.

Great advances have been made for the emancipation of woman from servitude to unjust and cruel prejudices. Her wages have been increased. Her sphere of action and influence has been enlarged. And the way is opened for still more lucrative and more responsible posts of labor and usefulness.

So in respect to another class of laborers in whom our sympathies have often been painfully interested. We mean boys and girls, who formerly were almost uniformly overworked, and insufficiently clothed and fed.

In almost every direction, are opening to the young greater opportunities for earning money, greater advantages of education. They have more comfortable and more becoming clothing, more time for reading and study, and there is no comparison in the facilities which they have for procuring books and instruction.

We do not mean that there is nothing more to be desired, or that either operatives or capitalists have come up to a full comprehension of the problem which they have to solve in relation to the education of the young, and the continued education afterwards which alone can prevent bright scholars of the schoolroom from sinking down into ignorant, ordinary men and women.

In some large manufacturing establishments, two sets of boys and girls have been employed to tend the same machines, each set working one part of the day and going to school the other part, thus earning money, and at the same time carrying on their education. It would be a great gain if this plan could be carried out everywhere, and with some modifications continued on through life. The great hindrance and objection to such a course comes usually, not from the employers, but from the laborers. They do not enter heartily into these measures for their own improvement, or the improvement of their children. Only a small proportion of them are willing to allow their children the time, or themselves take the pains, to go far beyond the elementary studies.

But this difficulty is not confined to the laboring classes. Very few children of any class — very few sons of merchants or professional men — care to go very far or very profoundly into any branches of study. Still the purposes of education, the highest ends of life, may be reached in other ways than by the study of books. Honest and useful habits of living may be acquired. Comfortable, enlightened, and affectionate homes have a greater influence than books or schools in forming the character, and elevating and purifying the tastes of a people. In order to this a certain amount of physical comfort is needed — wholesome food, rooms well warmed and supplied with an abundance of the pure air and light of heaven. Then there should be cherished habits of neatness and order. Habits not only of comfort, but of refinement may be cultivated, and with them, habits of mutual deference. With the exhausting labors of fourteen or fifteen hours a day, and only pay enough to provide for the bare necessities of life, this was an impossibility. But now the opportunity is given. And if only the taste is acquired, if only the wish and the will are found, the means of gratification and improvement will be sure to follow.

But here, again, the great difficulty is with the laboring classes. Capitalists with whom we have talked say that where better houses have been built for their operatives, in a

few weeks they have been so defaced and defiled as entirely to defeat their purpose. But where there is a beginning there will be progress. A few persons of nicer habits may set the example. A higher standard of comfort may be introduced, and gradually extended, till the condition of a whole neighborhood or a whole community is sensibly improved.

One great apparent trouble is that we are constantly receiving new laborers from abroad, who come here with the thriftless, untidy, and sometimes almost brutal habits of extreme indigence, to which they have been accustomed. And when they have improved a little others of the same sort crowd in, and those who are most advanced disappear. Thus the laborers in a factory, like the pupils in a college, seldom seem to advance beyond certain limits, because new and comparative ignorant classes are constantly coming in. But then men and women with improved habits — the advanced classes — are constantly graduating and diffusing themselves with a better civilization through the land.

We believe that there has been great progress in the domestic and social life of the laboring classes. The operatives in our factories of to-day may not be of so high a character for intelligence and virtue as were our farmers' sons and daughters who occupied the same place thirty or forty years ago. But now they set out from a lower grade. If we take the persons who were connected with our factories then, and follow them and their families on to the present hour, we shall find, upon the whole, an immense improvement in their physical, moral, intellectual, and social position. They do not fill the same places. Few of them live in the same town. Many of them have changed their occupation. Some have gone into mercantile or professional pursuits. Some of them are very rich and hold high and responsible positions in society. But those who still belong to the class of laborers — they and their children — in the homes which they now occupy, in the physical comforts which they enjoy, in the taste which is shown in their houses, their furniture, their gardens, in the books which we see lying round in their homes, in their domestic habits, and the topics of conversa-

tion, have made great progress, and we shall find in them decided marks of social advancement.

Within our memory, there was not a piano in the country town with which we were most familiar. We doubt whether there were half a dozen wash-stands and basins in the town, so that members of the family or their guests could wash themselves in their own rooms. There was the most brilliant display of pewter ware. There was the whitest and nicest of linen, from the table-cloths and pillow-cases to the long winding-sheets which some of the oldest women kept by them sometimes for many years against the day of their burial. But there were hardly more carpets in the town than could be counted on the fingers of one hand, and nearly every one of them had been spun and woven in the house where it was used. As to books,—there was “the eternal book,” as it has been called, for all the weary and heavy laden—but very few besides. There was a sort of comfort, a sort of abundance, and a great hospitality; but there was, compared with the present time, an exceeding bareness in our homes and very great discomfort, especially in the winter, when it was no light or pleasant matter for the young folks to retire shivering for the night, unless favored with a place in the trundle bed near the kitchen fire, or having a good-sized cat to use as a warming-pan. One hundred dollars was then thought enough to purchase the furniture for a young woman about going to house-keeping, with the exception of her linen, and a feather bed or two which she had contrived to extract from the family geese. Comparing with this the houses and homes in the same place now, we see that the progress has been immense.

The school advantages are now a great deal better than they were then. For very bright minds, the schools then performed a great and important office, and were perhaps as useful and important as they are now. But for ordinary minds, that is, for the great majority of pupils, the advantages of education both in school and in after years are beyond all comparison greater now than they were then.

But is there a corresponding progress in the education of



the laboring classes? Are they trained and educated into wider views of truth, into better ideas and habits of life? We believe that they are, that the great opportunities opened are not entirely neglected. There are immense disadvantages and drawbacks which must not be overlooked. The farmer labors in the open air and sunlight, and that is both to body and mind a great privilege which is denied to persons engaged in almost every other pursuit. The confined and impure atmosphere in which most factory operatives and most mechanics have to spend the greater part of their time has a debilitating and an irritating influence on the nerves, and is unfavorable to the best physical development. The average length of life is greater than it was, but there are fewer cases of robust and vigorous health.

This deficiency in vital energy, accompanied as it is by increased nervous susceptibility and excitability, has its dangerous side, which cannot be too carefully guarded against. The fault of a farming population where they go on in the same pursuit for centuries, is, a stupid aversion to all change. There are classes in France—the ignorant peasantry—who make no progress in their ideas, but in philosophy and religion adhere to the old order of things, voting always for the pope or emperor whoever he may happen to be. Here is their danger. But with mechanics and factory operatives, there is a nervous impatience with things as they are. They would have everything changed. And yet, they may not have the substantial strength of purpose and the steadfast perseverance which are needed to accomplish the grandest results. They act from momentary impulses and excitements more than from deep-seated permanent convictions. And the tendencies have an influence both for good and evil in every movement that is made for their personal or social improvement. They undertake a great deal more than they can perform. And so indeed does every one who has a high ideal in life!

But do they, upon the whole, take advantage of the great opportunities which ought to be afforded to them by the immensely increased productiveness of labor? Are they



rising into a higher plane of civilization? With greater school advantages, with better and more tasteful clothing, with better furnished houses, with better churches and libraries and social organizations, have they better furnished minds, better moral and religious principles, more enlightened views, and better habits? These are the great questions. We cannot answer them in detail. We believe that there has been, upon the whole, progress in the right direction. But in seeking for an answer to questions like these, so complicated in their operations, we must remember that when we look to the elevation of whole classes of society, a great educational, social, and moral revolution, even where there is, upon the whole, decided progress, can be accomplished only through a succession of generations. In India it is said that the best skill in making the finest shawls is to be found only among the descendants of those who through many generations have been engaged in that kind of work. These generations of men, passing away like the leaves of the forest, are nevertheless wonderfully linked in together. We never can wean ourselves entirely from our mother's bosom. Away back a century or two, some ancestor of ours ate sour grapes, and to-day our teeth are set on edge. Our great, great grandfathers had grand times drinking and carousing, and we feel the effects of their excesses in our bones to-day. And so of their virtues, they also go into the common inheritance. What we call education is but modifying a little, from age to age, the sturdy qualities of our own human nature. The race is mightier than the individual. The old Adam modified and strengthened by the experience of over two hundred generations is too strong for any one of us in any partial contest of ours, and will not be expelled at once by any extempore schemes that we can make.

But, with the opportunities of which we have spoken, there is a tendency towards a better order of things. The Millennium will not come suddenly. But under the great providence of God there is a silent, but majestic march onward toward the establishment of his kingdom in the world.

We have spoken of material advantages, of the increased

productiveness of labor, and the opportunities for a higher advancement which it may open before us. These facts are significant. In the grand purifying alchemy of the divine Providence nothing is common or unclean. Our schemes and hopes and labors for a higher condition of society are taken up into the divine forces which are always at work, and which cannot fail at last to accomplish his wise and beneficent ends.

But we must not be too much in haste to finish that work. Day unto day uttereth speech. One generation hands over all that it has learned to that which succeeds it, and then passes away. Wisdom will not die with us. We have our little contests. We strive to educate our children. Thirty or fifty years hence, when we are dead, it will be to be seen what sort of men and women they are. And if we really have done something to make them wiser and better than ourselves, they will educate their children better than we have educated ours. And if this good work continues to go on throughout the land from parent to child, who can tell what a commonwealth of moral harmony and spiritual greatness and more than royal magnificence will be inhabited by our children a thousand years after we have ceased from our labors?

In the mean time let us not be afraid to do what we can to adjust these little questions of labor and capital, of employer and employed — the wages question, the eight hour question — so that the poor shall not starve himself and his children in seeking to take some unjust advantage of the rich, and the rich shall not be permitted to grow richer by methods which necessarily cause the poor man to grow poorer. These are subjects which we had intended to introduce into this article. But they have been fleeing before us. Perhaps we should not have spoken wisely. One word is better than all that we could have written of these contests between capital and labor, where the near ox and the off ox are only worrying one another and making it all the harder for both to draw the load which, at the best, is hard enough for us all. One word is better than all the rest that we could say about these things. Let there

be justice and brotherly love between man and man — between one class and another. Then, whether we succeeded in this enterprise or that, whether we are rich or poor, will be of no concern to us when we come to think these matters over, in our new home, four or five hundred years hence.

---

## SAMUEL J. MAY.

BY AN OLD FRIEND.

I HAVE just returned from the funeral of Rev. Samuel J. May, whom I have known and loved and honored for more than fifty years.

The house of his daughter and son-in-law, where those nearest and dearest to him were met, seemed not like a house of mourning. It was not. He had been suffering from severe and painful disease. This had almost left him; and, on the very last day of his life, he had seemed so well that many of his friends had come from near and from distant places to see him, fearing, from the severity of the pain he had just passed through, that they might see him no more. With these he had conversed in his usual cheerful and affectionate, serious manner. He had walked about the room with more ease and strength than for a long time before. In the latter part of the evening he said to his daughter, "I am tired: I will lie down." Soon after, he said, gently, "I feel differently from what I ever felt before; can this be death?" and soon after, in a scarcely audible whisper, "Kiss me, Charlotte." He spoke not again. His pulse ceased beating, and he was dead — with that heavenly expression of gratified affection on his face. She had been apprehending for him another six weeks of suffering, and did not mourn now that he was at the end of all pain.

Those who were assembled, on that morning of the funeral, felt within their souls as if they could say, "Servant of God, well done!" as if the voice of the Infinite One were saying, even then, "Well done, good and faithful servant, enter thou into the joy of thy Lord." They listened together to words of prayer, and to many of those beautiful words of consolation, of hope, and of rejoicing, of which the divine records are so full. They talked of the great thoughts he had entertained, of the high purposes for which he had lived, of the fearless bravery with which he had sustained the right; of the kindness, sweetness, joyousness of his habitual conversation; of his attractiveness to children, and the interest he had always taken in them; of the cordial kindness with which he had always welcomed his friends; of the generous welcome he had always given to strangers, and how often those who had come to him indifferent or hostile had gone away friends; of the largeness of his benevolence towards all the suffering, the neglected, and the oppressed; how he had all his life been going about doing good, and living and preaching the gospel of peace.

These pleasant interchanges of remembrance and consolation were interrupted by the necessity of having the body—that face which they had been looking upon, so full of the heavenly repose of a sweet sleep, and from which every trace of earthly pain and care had entirely passed away forever—removed to the church, where very many, a great multitude, were waiting to take a last look of their friend.

When the body was gone, those at the house recalled the earlier days of Mr. May,—his cheerful, paternal home in Federal Court, his father, mother, and sisters, the sweet music of the Sunday-evening hymns, and the genial, Christian influences under which he had grown up.

The funeral services at the church were very interesting and very touching. But of these a full account has been given elsewhere. Nothing in them was more impressive than a few words uttered by the colored bishop, Loguen, who told what a change to him had been the coming of Mr. May to that town. Before, he had been alone, as in a wil-

derness, without sympathy, almost without a friend. But, when he had once met Mr. May, he realized, and had continued to realize, that there was one great, warm heart that felt for him, one to whom he might always go for wise counsel and help, and one strong arm on which he could lean, one who never put him off till to-morrow, — that he was never again without a friend.

The services at the grave, in the beautiful Oakwood Cemetery, were equally touching, especially the declarations of President White, of Cornell University, that Mr. May, as a counselor and friend, was unsurpassed, and that, judged by the words of the Saviour and his disciples, he was one of the noblest and purest Christians that had ever lived. Before the testimony of such a life, asked President White, who would dare to place any creed or profession of faith that had been or could be framed ?

Suffer me to speak, in a very few words, of the impression which this good man has made upon me through his long life. An account of that life ought to be, and must be, written for the permanent satisfaction of his friends, and for the instruction and imitation of every young man who desires to live a high and noble Christian life.

It is a life which almost every one might imitate. In college, he was not remarkable for talent or scholarship. He was perfectly faithful. He never neglected a duty. He always did what he had to do as well as he could. He never seemed to feel the spirit of rivalry. He never envied the success of another. He never excited an unkind feeling. He was friendly to all, intimate with a few, always ready to help and to do a kindness to every one ; not only amiable, but full of exuberant kindliness. He was a student then, and through life, not so much of books as of character, of men, of great principles and truths. He had an ardent admiration for the good and excellent. He had compassion for the bad : he was sorry for them, and felt that, in altered circumstances, he might have been like them. He had many friends : it is not known that he had one enemy. He was

a very agreeable companion and a general favorite; for he had a pleasant voice and sang good songs, merry or touching, and told good stories, or, rather, anecdotes. This latter talent he inherited, as he did many of the good things he said, from his father, who always drew from a rich and varied store. But he never told or sang a story or a song that could wound the most sensitive delicacy. It was not uncommon to hear, in reply to the question, "Do you mean to be at A's or B's to-night?"—"I don't know. Will May be there? Shall we hear 'At the Baron of Mowbray's Gate,' or 'The last Rose of Summer'?"—"Yes."—"Then I shall go."

He was sometimes very ready and even witty. On returning, just at the end of our college course, from a delightful excursion up the then new Woburn Canal to the Lake of the Woods, where he and I first saw Daniel Webster, the question arose, Who would get some water-lilies for the ladies from a little lily pond? May gallantly rushed into the water and brought out his hands full. Daniel Webster met him as he came dripping out, and said, "My fine fellow, I never gained a lily for a lady in my life." "No," answered May: "but you have won many a laurel."

At that time, as through life, he was gathering striking incidents and touching stories from his own observation and experience; and the point of almost every one was an illustration of that precious Christian art, the overcoming evil with good. No one ever understood that art better or practiced it more successfully. There was a particular department of the art, requiring uncommon skill and delicacy, in which he excelled: that is, so managing in regard to a person offended with him as to lead him to the doing a favor.

A gentleman at Brooklyn, of education and intelligence and respectable character and life, was much offended at something which Mr. May had said in an antislavery lecture, and frequently showed his feelings by very strong language. This man he knew to be proud of his melons, which he was cultivating with great success. Mr. May drove one day by that gentleman's garden and stopped. "Good morning, Mr.

S. How remarkably fine your melons are! I have never seen any so good in Brooklyn." Mr. S. seemed to take no notice, but kept on with his work. "Will you not be kind enough to give me one of those melons?" "Humph! humph!" growled Mr. S. "I do not ask for myself," added Mr. May: but my wife has been ill, and hardly has an appetite for anything; and she said, this morning, that, if she could get a ripe melon, she thought she could enjoy it." "Well, well, well!" muttered Mr. S., without turning from his work, "never mind, I'll think about it." That evening Mr. May received from Mr. S. a large basket of the finest melons. He sent his thanks; and, the next time he met the man, received a kind, almost cordial, greeting; and, not very long after, saw him among his audience, an attentive and respectful listener.

In 1820, Mr. May finished his theological studies. On the 20th of December, of that year, Daniel Webster, by his utterances in regard to the slave-trade, given in his great oration at Plymouth, did more probably than any other man ever did towards laying the foundation of the Antislavery Society. Mr. May was roused and mightily moved by that discourse, especially, as he afterwards often declared, by what Mr. Webster said of the duty of the Christian pulpit in regard to that trade. "I invoke the ministers of our religion that they proclaim its denunciation of those crimes, and add its solemn sanction to the authority of human laws. If the pulpit be silent, whenever or wherever there may be a sinner bloody with this guilt within the hearing of its voice, the pulpit is false to its trust."

Mr. May never forgot those words. For many years he ceased not to act under their influence; and if some friend could have repeated them to Daniel Webster himself on the morning of that fatal 7th of March, Daniel might have been now living, or he might have died one of the noblest and most respected, as he was the ablest, of all who have lived in America.

In 1821, he was ordained at Boston by Dr. Freeman, Dr. Channing, Dr. Greenwood, and Henry Ware, Jr., each of



whom seems to have breathed into him something of his own striking characteristics. They were all his friends, to whom he looked with profound reverence and warm affection. And hence, perhaps, we see in him the resolute independence and strong common sense of Freeman, the grasp of great original Christian principles of Channing, the simple earnestness and love of souls of Ware, and sometimes the delicate sweetness and exquisite finish of Greenwood. Dr. Greenwood was a faultless reader; and, the last time Mr. May preached in Cambridge, his reading of a part of the Sermon on the Mount was more eloquent and touching than any preaching could be.

He preached at various places, and was soon settled over a small parish in Brooklyn, Conn., constrained to go there by the feeling that, if he did not, they might not, in their straitened circumstances, be able to get a minister. He was here alone, the only Unitarian minister in the State. But he found time not only to preach the gospel faithfully and to the building up of his people, to defend the peculiarities of his faith, but to succor the oppressed, and to awaken a spirit in regard to the value of common-school education which had not previously existed in that State. The record of all the good things he did, in the cause of peace, temperance, education, justice, and freedom for soul and body, during the fourteen years of his ministry in Brooklyn, would fill a volume.

In 1825, he married the excellent and beloved woman with whom he continued to live in uninterrupted harmony and mutual devotion till May, 1865. They rest, side by side, in their graves under the noble trees of the Oakwood Cemetery.

Mr. May left Brooklyn in 1835 to become general agent of the Massachusetts Antislavery Society, in which office he earnestly advocated principles which appeared doctrines of dissension to many then, who now consider them the very doctrines of perpetual peace and everlasting justice.

In 1836, he was settled in a parish at South Scituate, in Plymouth County, rejoicing, he said, to cease from the bat-



ties of religious controversy, and give himself to preaching the simple, precious doctrines of the gospel.

Many people, probably most good men, especially good ministers, come, sometime in their early manhood, to the conclusion, after a little thought and examination, that intemperance is an enormous evil, that the education of the people is of vast importance, that the brotherhood of man and the other truths of the gospel are of infinite, unapproachable value, but yet go on, in their quiet path, as if they had never come to any such conclusion, or as if the world would take care of all these interests without their troubling themselves about them. Not so Mr. May. When he came to such a conclusion, he began immediately to act, and he continued to act as if its momentous importance were all the time present to his mind with controlling force. The consequences of this peculiarity of character were immediately very striking. The people of Scituate listened to him as if the gospel he preached were a new gospel. They were drawn to him and aroused as they had never been before; and the inhabitants of that place now look back to the six years of his residence there as if they must have been far longer than they were, so great a change was wrought.

Horace Mann found a warmer living interest in common-school education in Plymouth County than almost anywhere else, and traced it, in a large degree, to the active influence of Mr. May. When, therefore, Mr. Cyrus Pierce, the first Principal of the State Normal School, broke down from over-exertion, he insisted that Mr. May should take his place. It was in vain that Mr. May declared his incompetency to the duties of teaching, and his entire content with his place and office in the pulpit. Mr. Mann insisted; and Mr. May consented to go, on condition that Miss Caroline Tilden, who *did know how to teach*, should accompany him. They went together to the school at Lexington, where Mr. May supplied his deficiencies in experience and practice by qualities higher than mere skill in teaching, though that is a very high, and was then a very rare, quality; and Miss Tilden introduced a style

of teaching which was unsurpassed, and, perhaps, unsurpassable.

It is a precious fact that Mr. May, by the purity, elevation, and disinterestedness of his Christian character, without large experience or skill in teaching, should have been able to raise the tone of a school, the excellence of which, from the integrity, devotedness, and skill of its first teacher, had secured the blessings of normal-school instruction to the schools of Massachusetts. No sooner, however, had Mr. May heard that Father Pierce had recovered his health, than, though surprised and gratified at his own success, he resigned the office as to an older and better teacher.

He had gained experience, skill, and reputation of which the School Committee of Boston would have been glad to avail themselves, and invited him to take charge of one of their grammar schools. But his unwillingness to award the Franklin Medals, as then bestowed, prevented his accepting the appointment.

The secret of his success as a teacher was his sympathy. He treated each pupil as if she had been his daughter. He carried into the school the great principles of his Christian life. And such was the cause of his success as temporary minister in the church at Lexington. He reconciled the different parties and congregations to each other, and established peace where there had been contention. And so he lived and so he preached everywhere.

In 1843, he received a unanimous invitation to settle in Syracuse, and began his official services there in April of that year. He met at first the usual opposition from theological opponents. But the good in his great nature gradually, but completely, overcame the evil around him, and he achieved a triumphant success, which is, in these modern times, probably without example.

---

WHEN the counselor grows rusty, the counsel will be polished.

IF you cannot master the whole, yet do not forsake the whole.

## THE LIFE OF LIFE.

A SERMON. BY REV. ROBERT LAIRD COLLIER.

The life is more than meat. Luke xii. 23.

THE company of them is very great who have settled it with their own souls that meat, or its equivalent, is life. Were it less than settled there would be more room for hope; and then, too, they have settled it, not with custom and fashion, but with their souls. The conviction has entered in and possessed them as an evil spirit.

This thought which I have brought to you, first of all, is full of dreariness; that whilst we might all of us be angels, we are so many of us the companions of so low views. But we must not be hasty in censure; this disease of worldliness is so prevalent and so contagious we may catch it ourselves. It is in the custom of the world and the very air that surrounds it. Our fathers and our grandfathers lived in it, and no wonder if we have inherited the faith. But no man has ever taken this faith in meat wholly to his heart without doubts and suspicions.

Mammon and a man can finally get to be fast friends. I say it with shame, almost with despair, that I have known men who loved mammon better than wife and child, so, of course, better than God; men who have increased in wealth, and the love of it, until the two were wedded and both bound hand and foot and cast into outer darkness. For you have observed that there is no darkness like this darkness of mammon-worship; it closes the man in all round. This man is the most useless man in the world. It is sometimes strange that God — who is a jealous God — permits his own children to get so hedged about in darkness. Only it has always been the rule that when a man is self-willed and thinks that he knows best and wants to go his own wayward way, God lets him try it. Of course they know how thorny the road is, but they keep on walking it, thinking each turn will make it better. Thorny! probably not one of us knows how thorny.

There are queer personages met on this road : it is haunted with ghosts — oppressed widows and orphans come back in the spirit to accuse, helpless to do more ; ghosts of thieves and robbers, who break in and steal ; and then the most direful enemy the miser can have, poverty, stares him in the face all along. You see he has thought of poverty so much to arm himself against it, it will not away. How can this mammon-worshiper tell what his securities are worth, what fire and famine, pestilence and financial failures, may destroy ? I say it is a thorny way where all these haunting spectres come. Indeed, any way is thorny unillumined by faith and trust in God ; and you can easily apprehend how it works, with mathematical exactness, that just as a man gets faith in mammon he transfers it from God. The Holy One said, "Ye cannot serve God and Mammon." You may serve God and have mammon, or you may serve mammon and have God, but to serve both is impossible. Only one can be worshiped. In worshiping God one must be *all there*, as in worshiping mammon one is *all there*. I never yet knew a man walking devoutly before this god, Self, making his penance before him and feeling ten thousand pangs of conscience, worse than instruments of fleshly torture, that did not mean to break off at the next promising turn of the road, but usually says to his lust of gold, —

"Thou art the man, and I'm but dross to thee."

How can we lift this load of horror from any brother's soul and show him that life is more than meat ?

To answer this question is to solve the problem of life. There is a life in all things — it consists in the abundance of things. I say it is *a life* that you may understand me — of course, it is only a semblance of life. This is the pantomime — the make-believe — of life. It goes often for genuine, like a counterfeit bill ; but when the final inspection comes it is thrown out, for it represents no pure gold.

What is so deceiving as substitutes *for* life where there is no life ? When one has no root in himself he blames the place or the circumstance that he does not thrive.

The East is no better than the West ; the South is no better than the North ; the Old Country is no better than the New. I have not a grain of faith that the new place is any better than the old. I have, indeed, not a grain of faith in any process that *only* contemplates outward repair. Life works from within — always so works. Some men think if they were rich they would be benevolent ; but riches never make men generous : the light of God and the love of men are the joint sources of mercifulness. Many a woman firmly believes that if her house were only adapted to it she would be a model housekeeper ; but the house does not make the mistress, but the mistress makes the house.

It will be impossible to the end of time to cure the ills of the world by outward repairs, but it can be done by inward light and joy. One goes into a house with one room : here is kitchen, chamber, parlor — all, just as well, in reality, one room as twenty — and so soon as foot crosses its threshold one says, "Here is life, here is a spirit : this one room has a soul in it, and stove, bed, and table, children, all included — everything is brimful, running over with life. Everything nods its head to you and says, "Yes, yes, yes, come in, come in, we are all here, all glad to see you." It is just like when we come across a man whose face is plain and homely, and yet we say, "That face is lovelier than a calla lilly ;" so it is, for a pure face is more beautiful than the most beautiful flower. And what made it more beautiful ? mere houses and lands, elaborate toilettes and equipages ? Indeed, it is hard to have all these things and a beautiful face too, unless God has taken another way — the way of great inward grief and sorrow — to soften the soul so it will radiate all over the features and blend them and chasten them into a whole beauty.

To answer my own question, I must say, that self-limitation, restraint, denial, so that it shall mean grief, must have folded its wings in the soul before there is any beauty in the face. Angels of light must guard the entrance to the eye before another eye can see a paradise back of it in the soul ; for through the eye comes light ; the eye draws to, or drives from. All men are *so* pure that they love pure men — that

is, they are so much pure they stand in awe of purity. A plain home does not bring contentment, but a contented spirit can light up a plain home and make it a paradise. George McDonald says a great and suggestive thing in this sentence: "There are mothers and mothers; and for a mother not to be a mother is too dreadful." But how true it is that, even in this sacred thing of being a mother, the outward fact may be at war with the inward ideal.

Then life is not in things. No thing is life. Houses, lands, business, prosperity, friends, success, health, not one of these things is life, all together cannot give it or take it away. How can I make you see, dear friends, how this is so. *I cannot.* Open your minds to God and he will cause you to *feel* it, and just when you come to feel this that I have said, you get life and are living. We are alive because God was alive first, and we are alive because he has thrown out his image into us. The only life there is, is the "life had with Christ in God."

One may put *his* life unto these dead things and they may become alive; but it is not their life, but his life—like a tree is dead till God puts life into it. All these things are under the dominion of man's spirit.

A man who has meat cannot give it. You never knew a man who had meat only that gave it away to another; but if he have life he can give that away and meat too. A plain man, uneducated, indeed with little furniture of intellect, if he have life, can give life. We are drawn to people by this law of life: they have to give us or they have to receive from us. They must have something either to give or receive.

Spiritual things will not stay for definitions. Were religion at any disadvantage this would be its chief. I can define intellectual things as I can demonstrate that two and two are four, or work out a problem of Euclid; but I can only tell of life and tell life if I have any life in me, but tell what *is* life, I cannot.

Because men cannot see it (they do in its operations), but in its essence, they deny there is any. Büchner has hunted

it down, but did not catch it, failed to find it—it escapes all physiology. Yes, it sweeps past everything but faith and prayer.

So the essential thing, how it comes to man, of this I can say something. In its highest illumination there must be, as the very starting-point, *repose of the soul*. Repose out of self. Abraham left his house to walk with God; for there was more repose in the journey than in the home. The soul of man can only be present with God when absent from itself, that is, when it knows nothing as its own. I do not see how a man can find repose in himself, for the law of his being is change, even warfare; and, if self-centred, his spirit will be like the furrowed face of the sea after a night of storm. Self-will is madness. Self-will may dare, but cannot *bear*; and there is no repose until there is endurance. It may cost one heart-blood to dare, but it always costs soul-blood to bear. Repose being the soil—God himself is the subsoil—there will spring up a fine *mastery of conditions*, so that in whatever estate man finds himself, all chafing and unrest have gone out of it.

This always precedes *identity with the universal*. Man must first be lost to himself before he finds himself in the universal whole, where his sympathies touch every living thing; and then out of this, in turn, springs absolute identity with the infinite and eternal, when the man belongs not here and now in any important sense in which he does not belong everywhere and always. There may be a life which is the creature of organic factors, and I do not mean to have dispute about this hypothesis, which no science has yet demonstrated and no psychology has disproved; but there is a life—it may be the life of life—which in its own nature *is*. For we know that when we pursue life for ourselves the light of life goes clean out, and the horror that dwells in darkness breathes cold upon our spirits; that when we seek the life for others there is there a life within as full and fragrant as a June morning. I have meant to contradict no seen reign of God among men, for it is better to possess houses, lands, great means, than not to possess them, if only there is this life of



the spirit which is the master of these, that lights them all up into beacon-lights, that they become a law of assurance and helpfulness to all sojourners. Only, all these without life—the life of repose and mercifulness—are dead weights, ay! damning weights. The less a man has who has no spiritual life the better off is he, not only because of less accountability and less torment of conscience, but he is better off in his prospect and promise of life.

But when life is in every thing a man has, the more he has the better. Meat is not life. Life is more than meat; it consists not in things, nor in the abundance of things. It is righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Spirit.

“Had I the grace to win the grace  
Of some old man complete in lore,  
My face would worship at his face  
Like childhood seated on the floor.

“Had I the grace to win the grace  
Of childhood, loving, shy, apart,  
The child should find a nearer place,  
And teach me resting on my heart.

“A grace I have no grace to win  
Knocks now at my half-open door,  
Ah, Lord of Glory! come Thou in,  
Thy grace divine is all and more.

---

THE evils which arise from jesting upon Scripture are greater than appear at first. It leads, in general, to irreverence for Scripture. When we have heard a comic or vulgar tale connected with a text of Scripture, such is the power of association that we never hear the text afterwards without thinking of the jeer. The effect of this is obvious. He who is much engaged in this kind of false wit will come at length to have a large portion of Holy Scripture spotted over by his unholy fancy.

## A REVIEW OF THE SITUATION.

ONE of the most prominent men in our denomination is reported to have used the following language in an address before the recent annual meeting of the American Unitarian Association :—

“Notwithstanding all the manifestations of interest which have grown up in our body during a few years past, due, perhaps, to larger freedom, due to a better understanding with each other, due to a more comprehensive policy, nevertheless, whilst it is growing at the one end, it always seems to be dying out at the other. And whilst it is growing, perhaps, in respect to the interest of certain portions of the community, it is gradually losing the vigorous hold which it once had on the men of property. There is at present existing among us a certain want of practical efficiency, of sound judgment, of comprehensive attention to the whole business of preparation for the ministry, and especially an excessive carelessness with regard to the material on which we labor. It is not money we need so much as wisdom, faith, and knowledge.”

The tone of these remarks is, in one respect, rather discouraging to those who believe with all their hearts that Unitarianism proper is entitled to greater success than has ever attended the administration of any other type of religious faith,—that, as it is demonstrably more consonant with reason and the impulses and necessities of human nature, it must have in it more of the elements that win popular favor.

And, yet, disheartening as it is to know that our cause is not prosperous, it is encouraging to be assured on high authority that the fact is attributable, not to the cause itself, but to a mal-administration of our affairs. If our ministers are beginning to see that our denomination “is gradually losing the vigorous hold which it once had on the men of property,”—that “there is existing among us a certain want of practical efficiency, of sound judgment, of comprehensive attention to the whole business,” not “of preparation for the ministry” alone, but also to all the other affairs of the denom-

ination, — if, imperative as our need of money is, and Heaven knows it is great, we are beginning to feel that our “need of wisdom, faith, and knowledge” is still greater, surely there is some hope in our case; for, though a physician cannot cure every disease which he fully understands, yet he is not likely to cure one which he does not understand. Knowledge of the condition of the patient, and, if possible, of the causes which produced it, is necessary first of all. The foregoing diagnosis of our denominational disease is undoubtedly correct. Let us inquire in regard to the cause of the general prostration.

The confidence of men of property is a great element of denominational prosperity. We need money every day in the year, and quite as much we should have been likely to receive, if we had won and retained the largest confidence of all our wealthy men, and each had given according to his ability; and this is saying a great deal, for we have in our body a very large proportion of rich men who are proverbially generous. And yet, while the members of other denominations have been giving for some years past as never before, — have been putting enormous sums into denominational headquarters, publishing houses, colleges, and theological schools, and contributing the means of extending and energizing missionary operations, — while the Orthodox Congregationalists are raising three million dollars, and the Presbyterians five millions, for special work this year, and the Methodists are dedicating three churches per day, and the New England Baptists have been displaying great activity and liberality by adding two hundred thousand dollars to the endowment of the Newton Theological School, we are gasping for breath; our denominational enterprises are languishing, our schools are ineffectually begging for money, our home-missionary labors are nearly suspended, our hands are tied, and all because the affairs of the denomination have been so badly managed that the confidence of the men who alone have much money to give has been forfeited.

Our business men are thoroughly practical. They are not so unwise as to attempt to administer their affairs on hair-brained crotchets. They comprehend the nature and rela-

tions of things and know how to handle the world. They read human nature—foresee the outcome of causes and govern themselves accordingly. They are not theorists or dreamers, but statesmen, lawyers, bankers, railroad presidents, merchants, and manufacturers, sagacious and trustworthy, self-respecting, energetic, and laudably ambitious men, who manage their own affairs on the assumption that honesty, industry, and frugality are entitled to large success. These are the men who have lost confidence in the administration of our denominational affairs. Why! was the result unexpected? Certainly not. It has been predicted again and again to the very men who, more than any others, have been instrumental in bringing it about. They have been repeatedly forewarned of the consequences of their "policy" upon our people at large.

The truth is, our denomination has been placed before the world in an attitude in which our men of property have no confidence, and in which they refuse to support it; and herein is the secret of the whole matter. Names and facts could be given in support of this statement that would appall those who have supposed that our men of property would follow any and every leader. The affairs of our body have been administered on the supposition that our laymen had no definite religious convictions, or, if they had, that they would give money quite as freely to support and disseminate principles and doctrines which they earnestly disbelieve and deprecate, as the faith dearest to their souls. This is no exaggeration: it is the exact statement of the case. Now if we as a religious body do not know that men will not give money freely to propagate a type of thought which they believe to be doing a vast amount of harm, or, while there is doubt in regard to the character of the interests for the promotion of which their money will be used, and that they must lose confidence in the practical sagacity of those who even ask them to do it, then certainly we do "need wisdom, faith, and knowledge" more than money.

I. Our ministers have one policy and our laymen a very different one. Many of our ministers are Spencerian, Dar-

winian, and Emersonian : our laymen are intensely practical, — are among the most successful business men of the country ; and they would like to see displayed in our denominational concerns the same practical sagacity which gives them their pre-eminence in business affairs. Our ministers believe in philosophy, and that one system is as good as another if a man only thinks so : our laymen believe in religion. Many of our ministers are interested in Unitarianism as a means of propagating and defending intellectual freedom. They not only say practically, but insist, that one may believe in an authoritative revelation, in the church, in prayer and the Christian ordinances, and that a specific faith in these is essential to the best religious life, and another stoutly deny and earnestly repudiate the whole scheme of Christian truth, and labor to overthrow it by teaching exactly the opposite, and both be good Unitarian ministers, and that each should be willing to assist in extending the other's faith ; that Unitarianism is but another name for the freedom of every man to teach whatever may please his fancy, or gratify the most exceptional idiosyncrasy, and his right while so doing to be regarded as a Unitarian minister. The majority of our practical laymen believe that this is as complete an hallucination as ever danced before a bewildered imagination, and they refuse to furnish the means of prosecuting the senseless experiment.

II. Many of our ministers believe that Unitarianism is still an open question. They are very fond of running off on theological exploring expeditions. With them nothing is settled except that nothing can ever be settled, and the Unitarian Church is serviceable only because she fits them out most genteelly, and allows every man to run as he lists, even though he run himself, his crew and cargo to the bottom as many have done. It is exceedingly impertinent on the part of the church to ask any questions, or make any suggestions : it is only her business to pay the bills. And as we look over our denomination and see how very large some of these bills have been, how expensive, not to say humiliating, many of the experiments we have tried, how little we have to show for the money that has been given us, is it wonderful that "we are

gradually losing the vigorous hold we once had on the men of property," whose great and honorable success did not come from ignoring all the lessons of experience, or outraging public sentiment that is based upon the richest experience of the world? Considering the character of our distinguishing doctrines and principles, and their obvious adaptation to human nature, the pre-eminently auspicious inception of Unitarianism in this country,—the immense amount of wealth, scholarship, and intellectual vigor that have been identified with our cause,—the liberalizing influences of the age,—the tendencies and hospitality of the American mind, and the present diminutive size and the disintegrated and unpromising condition of our denomination, we have not the slightest claim to the confidence of the large and influential class of men who know perfectly well that in all laudable undertakings persistent industry and good judgment have a right to win. We are in the habit of saying that orthodox doctrines are repugnant to human nature and that ours are exactly adapted to it; and that both the intellectual and spiritual faculties instinctively appreciate the vast difference between the two. We are also in the habit of speaking of the American people as though they were rapidly approaching our position,—“too rapidly becoming liberal,” as one of our representative men recently put it. And yet the growth of Methodists, the Orthodox Congregationalists, the Baptists, the Episcopalians, is many, many times greater than our own. When an officer wins a battle, notwithstanding great and obvious disadvantages, and another, who had everything in his power, loses one, people will have their own opinions in regard to the generalship respectively displayed.

III. Many of our ministers believe that Unitarianism is a very good religion among several others nearly as good, and that one may take his choice, reject the whole, or invent one to suit himself, and still be a very good Unitarian. But who does not see that in all this there is no distinct bugle-call that excites enthusiasm and wins confidence, nothing that with clarion voice invites to the great sacrifice and consecration in which all rich and bounding blood delights—nothing

that stimulates Prussian pluck and endurance. It is the ambiguity and obfuscation which annihilate all difference between work and play, victory and defeat, being and seeming. It is only going through with religious "motions," as a light entertainment for those whose moral constitution is unable to bear anything strong or positive. It is a virtual confession that our life and thought are not sufficiently original, vigorous, or necessary to crystallize in congenial forms — it is a complete estoppel to improvement, but it is neither religion nor common sense. "To this complexion has it come at last."

And yet, with a type of Unitarianism that as a voice from a higher power should command the intellect instead of apologizing to it continually — that should not be an open but a fully-settled and all-comprehensive question, the very marrow and life of an authoritative Gospel — that, standing fairly and squarely on the letter of the New Testament, could meet all worldliness and sin on the one hand, and orthodoxy in all its forms on the other, and then with a leader who was wise but not conceited, determined but not ambitious, sufficiently conciliatory but not too amiable, comprehensive and yet modestly consistent and uniform in his action, we could not only regain the lost confidence of our men of property, excite such enthusiasm as inspires no other religious body, but we could also very soon rally under our banner a better class of young men than ever gathered under the flag of a religious sect.

The age is undoubtedly ripe for Liberal Christianity; but that it does not intend to accept of speculations or mere denials, instead of a religion, is proven by the ill-success of those who have attempted to make the irrational and unnatural change. There is a very large amount of true Christian liberalism in the various orthodox denominations, and it will remain where there is life, order, enterprise, success — where the experience, the wisdom, the practical sagacity that come from a large handling of the world, are applied to the management of ecclesiastical affairs, rather than allow itself to be organized under the leadership of those whose



administration has alienated the confidence of the wisest and best men of the country, simply because it is called liberal. We may belabor people till the crack of doom for their want of principle in adhering to orthodox denominations, but we shall not persuade them to identify themselves with a flagging cause. The hindmost horse has no friends. People believe in success. They are ready to listen to the arguments of the winning party. If we would effectually divert from our body the sympathy of the masses, we have only to assure them that Unitarianism has not the elements of popular success in it. They will not pause to infer logically that it cannot on the admission of its friends, be the church of Jesus Christ: they will simply let it alone severely. If we would utterly dishearten and disgust the best men in our body, we have only to convince them, as they have been told a hundred times, that the most and the best we can expect to do is to modify orthodoxy. Have we no knowledge of human nature? Do we not know that the general who wins no victories on his own account, but always retreats in good order, excites the contempt of his own men? We need money for our church in Washington, for our denominational headquarters in Boston, for Antioch College, for Meadville or Chicago or both, and for other things innumerable; and yet we have been told by one of our ablest men that "we need wisdom, faith, knowledge," even more! And though this is truly a humiliating exhibit of our poverty in administrative ability, still he would be a rash man who should declare it to be unjust.

A case in point illustrates the whole subject. Dr. Bellows is a firm believer in Christianity as a supernatural and authoritative revelation. He believes in the church and its ordinances, and in the necessity of a special religious experience. He is not simply a brilliant preacher; he is also one of the most faithful of religious pastors. He labors incessantly to establish his people in the faith of Christ, and but few ministers have made themselves so largely felt in their respective communities, or greatly comforted so many souls in their leave-taking of earth, by repeating and expounding to them the precious words of the Master.

Mr. Frothingham, on the contrary, is laboring with all his power to bring these things into general disrepute. He rejects the Bible, the church and its ordinances. He believes in prayer only in a very Pickwickian sense. He is most earnestly opposed to the religious doctrines and measures that are nearest and dearest to Dr. Bellows' heart.

Practically and to all intents and purposes, these men are operating against each other. The complete triumph of the principles of either would completely overthrow the other. Charles Sumner and Jefferson Davis are no more antipodal politically than these are religiously. Neither would give a dollar, or ask his people for a dollar, to help the cause of the other, because neither has the slightest faith in the work the other is doing. And yet Rev. W. T. Clark, one of the ministers of our body, who was perfectly acquainted with these facts, assumed at the last meeting of the American Unitarian Association that both of these men were good Unitarian ministers, and added, "Now what we want is to train up a set of men, who, like these two men, shall carry our thought through this country." "*Our thought*"! What thought? This is a very important question; for carefully withholding the fact that these men occupy so little religious ground in common that they can work together no more than a radical Calvinist and a Universalist, Mr. Clark assumed, and was not rebuked or criticised for his assumption, that it is equally our thought that the Bible contains the most precious truth of God for the souls of men, and that its use is a burden and "superstition," — that prayer is the soul's cry that God delights to hear, and that it is all "wasted upon inexorable laws," — that the church has grown up around the soul's deepest necessities, and should be cherished and fostered as a conduit of the divine life, and that it is a relic of the dark ages that impedes true progress; and so on to the end of the chapter. These point blank and startling contradictions are alike "*our thoughts*"! And the astounding paradox is that Dr. Bellows, with all his earnest Christian faith and culture, that have blessed so wonderfully scores of the living and the dead, has done as much as any other man to

prevent any discrimination in our denominational action for or against either of these two types of thought! And this fairly illustrates the policy of the denomination. We have long been riding these two horses that are heading in exactly opposite directions, and the attempt to abandon either has been repeatedly resisted.

It is true that the last National Conference resolved that it was a Christian body, and yet there is not the slightest doubt but that a man occupying Mr. Frothingham's theological position could be ordained as a minister anywhere in the denomination. It may be presumed that Dr. Bellows himself would assist. How could he refuse to do so, consistently with what he has recently said of such men? Is it wonderful, therefore, that we have lost the confidence of our practical, sagacious business men? A railroad president, who had learned from a bitter experience that repeated collisions destroy public confidence and depreciate his stock, could not, on our own showing, be wheedled into making a large investment in our denominational concern.

We are continually acting on the presumption that devout Christian believers will give their money freely to establish churches, notwithstanding the probability that they will be Connor-ized in a few years. It is undoubtedly the purpose of the American Unitarian Association to work for the up-building of Christianity; but in how many ways may it be thwarted, and how ineffectual must be its efforts, while men who openly discard Christianity have no difficulty in finding their way into our ministry. Verily, our "need of wisdom and knowledge" is very great.

A large number of our most influential ministers and laymen, understanding the condition of things to be as above set forth, and having protested for years against the insidious and destructive influences that have led to it, have at last withdrawn from all active participation in our denominational affairs. Their advice has been disregarded, and the spirit and purpose of the body have been so modified that they can now have little or no interest in it. They are Unitarians only because Unitarianism, as they understand it, is truest to

the letter and spirit of the Gospel as a supernatural revelation. Therefore, if they were compelled to move from their present base, they would gravitate more naturally toward a type of positive Christianity, though it might be styled orthodox and associated with some errors, than toward any form of speculation avowedly anti-Christian, because it was labeled as Unitarianism. They have also been greatly mortified and chagrined that the most vigorous and determined organization in this country that openly declares its chief purpose to be the overthrow of Christianity was called into being and is still directed by men whose names are published from year to year, by denominational approval, among those of our duly accredited ministers, and several of whom are pastors of Unitarian societies. And because they are unwilling to be associated with so irrational and disastrous a conglomeration; because they prefer to stand alone rather than acquiesce in the indifference to positive and distinctive Christianity which is characterizing Unitarianism more and more, they are stigmatized as follows by the Chicago correspondent of "The Liberal Christian:"—

"But there is something sad to me in the fact that so many of our ablest and wisest ministers in and around Boston no longer have interest enough in these anniversary meetings to attend them, men who have always been identified with the Unitarian faith, its warmest advocates and defenders, not showing the least interest in devising and supporting measures to scatter that faith through the country. What does it mean? Is it creditable to them? If we have any work to do, why do these men hang back, keep out of sight, and shirk it? If affairs are not conducted according to their ideas, why do they not come forward and take them in their own hands; show us what ought to be done and how to do it?"

If the Chicago correspondent really supposes that these two parties can work together harmoniously, while each would build first of all the things that the other would prefer never to have built, he or she furnishes another illustration of our great need of "wisdom." And yet this is the continual assumption,—the ever-recurring blunder of the Unitarians.

## A REVIEW REVIEWED.

BY THE EDITOR.

WE publish to-day an important article which we have received through the Rev. Thomas Hill, D.D. We do not know who the writer is. He aims at some of the weak points in the Unitarian body, and there is much force in what he says. But most of his statements need to be qualified. The example which he gives of Dr. Bellows and Rev. O. B. Frothingham working side by side in the same denomination, one building up what the other is pulling down, has not in reality a hundredth part of the force that our correspondent attributes to it. In fact, they do not belong to the same denomination. Mr. Frothingham has not been expelled from the Unitarian body. His name still appears in the annual register of Unitarian ministers. But practically he does not belong to the Unitarian body. He has no sympathy with it. He has practically withdrawn from it, and connected himself with another and very different religious association. Whatever Mr. W. T. Clarke, in the amplitude of his rhetorical hospitality, may have pictured to us, he knew well enough that Dr. Bellows and Mr. Frothingham are working in two entirely distinct and independent religious organizations. The Unitarian Association is closely connected with Dr. Bellows and he with it; but the Unitarian Association and Mr. O. B. Frothingham have no sympathy with each other's methods and beliefs, and no responsibility for one another. The same may be said of all the leading men who earnestly sympathize with Mr. Frothingham in his views and are zealous co-workers with him in the Free Religious Association. Messrs. Weiss, Potter, Higginson, Conway, and Abbot would scorn and scoff at the idea of their belonging to the Unitarian body. It is not fair, therefore, to hold the Unitarian body responsible for their teachings and influence, or to hold them responsible for its doings. Their separation from us is none the less complete because it has been entirely informal and voluntary on their part.

There is a wide-spread misconception among Unitarians in regard to this matter. We assume as a denomination no ecclesiastical authority. We as a body claim no right of excommunication. We are Congregationalists, and hold that each congregation as a Christian organization is entirely competent to manage its own affairs. It has the right to choose, to settle, and to dismiss its ministers. If unsuitable ministers are employed, the fault is not with the neighboring ministers who have no voice in the matter, but with the laymen who choose and support the ministers. The ministers of our denomination are not the ministers who are chosen or approved by the Unitarian Association or Unitarian conferences, but by the parishes. If the Unitarian Association has sometimes employed unsuitable ministers, it is because they had first been introduced into the denomination by the parishes.

But the number of ministers who do not accept Christianity as a divine revelation and who have been employed by the Unitarian Association is very small. Not one dollar in ten has been paid for the services of any but persons of unquestionable fidelity as Christian believers. But there is a difficulty which we would not ignore, and if we will only recognize and meet it fairly, we believe that it may be substantially remedied.

The difficulty arises from the entirely free and informal manner in which men are first introduced to our pulpits, and accepted as ministers of our denomination. If we are in quest of a cook we wish to learn something about her moral character and her qualifications for the place which she is to fill. When a merchant wishes for a clerk he makes very careful inquiries in regard to his honesty, his education, and his ability. If he comes from another firm he requires testimonials from them. Ought we to be less careful in regard to the moral, intellectual, and educational fitness of those who seek admittance into our pulpits as Christian teachers? A minister among the Universalists or the Orthodox fails to meet the requirements of the Christian body with which he is connected, or sees that he cannot work to advantage

among them. He may or he may not have lost his faith in Christianity. He may or he may not have been a man of pure heart and life. He may or he may not have the fitting moral, intellectual, and educational qualifications for the Christian ministry. But he has a plausible manner, a good address, and is perhaps an attractive speaker. He is drawn towards us, and makes the acquaintance of a Unitarian layman who takes an interest in him and perhaps asks his minister to invite him to preach for him. He makes a favorable impression there, and from that time is ready to preach in any of our pulpits. A parish without a minister is pleased with him and gives him a call, knowing nothing about him beyond his services for two or three Sundays. The fact that he came there to preach and that they liked his preaching is all the evidence that they ask of his fitness for one of the most confidential and responsible offices in the world. The people give him a call. Neighboring ministers are invited to assist at his installation. And yet nobody asks questions, or is supposed to have a right to ask questions. He is received into the sacred relation, which gives him access to the homes and the confidence of a confiding people—and all this is done with far less knowledge of his mind and character than we should require of a porter in a warehouse or a servant in our families. And what is the result? Sometimes in the largeness of our hospitality an angel may be entertained unawares. And sometimes men are received who are wholly unfitted for the Christian ministry—men without education or character, with lax ideas on all subjects—men ordinary or vulgar in mind, expression and manners, or with a plausibility of speech and bearing which hides the barrenness of thought, the looseness of sentiment, and perhaps the positive immorality of life, which lie underneath.

The same remarks apply to the way in which young men who wish to be admitted to the ministry are received. If any young man, no matter what his character, wishes to preach, he has only to offer himself, and if he can find half a dozen persons to hear him, and they wish to ordain him, some of the most respectable ministers among us, recogniz-



ing no one's right to ask questions or to go behind the act of the people who wish to settle him, give the sanction of their presence and their services to the act by which he is set apart as a Christian minister.

Now, what is the consequence of this? A general lowering, in the popular mind, of what is required in the profession, and of the respect which is due to it. Under this loose administration we are likely to have ministers who are neither scholars nor thinkers, neither wise nor virtuous, who neither believe in the doctrines, nor seek to practice the precepts, of our religion. We have already had lamentable examples of this kind.

Some steps have been taken in some of our local conferences to remedy the evil. The writer of this article acknowledges with regret that, being preoccupied by other matters, he once failed to give the attention which he ought to have given to the subject when it was brought before him as a member of a committee appointed for the purpose of taking it into consideration. We believe that something may be done. Formerly, when candidates for the ministry were almost all educated at college and in a theological school, they had been trained for seven years or more under the eye of learned and responsible men, whose approval was a sufficient testimonial of intellectual and moral fitness. But now more than three-quarters of the candidates for the ministry are men whose life and training previous to their admission to a theological school are comparatively obscure and unknown. It is, therefore, important that careful inquiry should be made into their habits of life, their habits of thought, their experiences and associations. No young man fitted for the Christian ministry would object to such an investigation. He would rather ask for it and rejoice in it. It would be well for a parish about to give a call to a minister but little known to them to appoint for this purpose a committee of their ablest and best men. Or the old way might be revived of inviting a council to make the examination for the parish, and to make it thoroughly, requiring of the candidate undoubted testimonials of good character and

of intellectual and Christian fitness for the office. We have been too remiss in these matters, and both our parishes and our cause are suffering in consequence. Our dread of interfering with individual liberty has sometimes opened the door to persons of easy morals and in other respects wholly unfitted for the Christian ministry.

A common-school district does not invite any plausible man who may offer himself to be their teacher. But a committee of the most competent persons in the town is chosen to look into the testimonials of the candidate and subject him to a scrutinizing examination. Should less care be taken in the choice and settlement of a minister?

But how about his belief? Have we a right to look into that? A Christian church and society will, of course, want a Christian minister. The candidate may be an honest man, and yet may not believe in Christianity. In that case, he will not wish to impose himself on a Christian society as a Christian teacher. And, if he is not honest enough to withdraw voluntarily, they have a right to secure themselves against him. If he has not faith enough in Christianity, as revealed in the Gospels, to accept the truths contained there as the great means by which he is to lead men into a better life, then his place is not with us, but with the Free Religionists. We have a right to protect ourselves against such ministers, and they have a right to seek a field where they may be free to abjure all allegiance to Christ. And the sooner the separation is made the better for them and for us.

Our traditions of liberty have allowed to each man perfect freedom in the interpretation of the Christian writings, — i.e., perfect freedom within Christianity; but not freedom to reject it altogether, and set aside its authority. Farther than that we cannot go without going outside of Christianity. When a minister who does not believe in Christianity or Christian institutions is settled in one of our old-fashioned Unitarian parishes, and begins to preach against the observance of Sunday, against the church, against the miracles, against the authority of Christ, gradually undermining the whole fabric of Christianity, lessening the reverence of his people for

things which they have held sacred, shocking the conscientious and devout by the light and flippant air with which he treats the most solemn themes, — the spectacle is a very sad one. Gradually the Christian believers go away grieved and afflicted, driven out from the sanctuary of their faith; and just in proportion as the minister succeeds in convincing those of the congregation who remain that the church and its institutions and ordinances are only the creations of an old superstition, they will cease to attach any particular value to his services, and the parish falls away. Its life is gone. This is the mournful process that has weakened and destroyed many a substantial old parish, or nipped with a deadly frost the budding promise of many a thriving young society. We must guard ourselves against this condition of things, or our days as a denomination are numbered.

We like liberty, but we revere truth and honesty. We believe in calling things by their right names, in accordance with the essential fitness of things; and therefore it seems to us an imposition and a fraud when a man who does not believe in Christ or his religion assumes the office of a Christian minister, and makes use of the pulpit and the church to overthrow and destroy them both. We believe in liberty. We believe in the liberty of the Roman Catholic to worship God according to his own conscientious convictions, and to exclude from his peculiar church those who do not accept its fundamental doctrines. We believe in the liberty of the Free Religionist to preach his beliefs and his unbeliefs, and to exclude and drive away, as he does by his denunciations, those who cannot sympathize with him. But we do not believe in the right of a Jesuit to work his way as a minister into one of our Unitarian parishes, and by the wonderful cunning of his order to use our religious ministrations so as to undermine the faith of his people and indoctrinate them with principles subversive of all the rights of private judgment. Nor do we believe in the right of a Free Religionist to assume the name and office of a Christian minister among a Christian people that under that disguise he may introduce doctrines subversive of all Christian faith, institutions, and

observances. This is not a question of belief, but of honesty. We know at this time of young men just entering the ministry who are more pantheists than Christians, or perhaps unsettled in their intellectual and religious convictions rather than believers or unbelievers of any sort, and we say, that, as honest men, they have no right to offer themselves as candidates for the Christian ministry and to assume its functions in Christian churches. The same conscientious scruples which prevent them from pronouncing the apostolic benedictions should keep them from entering a Christian pulpit at all for the performance of duties which of themselves imply a belief in Christianity. The very position which they assume in a Christian pulpit as Christian ministers involves a moral inconsistency, and is in itself an act of dishonesty. Their place is not in the Unitarian, or in any other Christian denomination, but outside of them all. They ought to recognize this fact.

But suppose that they do not? Suppose that they should insist on belonging to our denomination and preaching? If parishes, knowing what they are, choose to employ them, we have no objection to make. But as a denomination, through our conferences and our Unitarian Association, we may refuse to recognize them. Must freedom in the gospel of Christ imply freedom from the gospel and from all the rules and regulations which everywhere else are essential in every organization. A new member cannot be received into a boat-club without a knowledge of his qualifications, and without binding himself to rules deemed essential to the order and success of the association. And shall young men be received, not merely as members of a Christian body, but as teachers and guides there, without examination and without any authentic knowledge of their antecedents and their present views and purposes?

There must be liberty, and, that there may be liberty, there must be some denominational rules and order, or we shall be rapidly disintegrated, and cease to be a denomination. The largest liberty there should be that is consistent with Christian faith and Christian living. But no more.

When a minister goes outside of these, he ceases to be a Christian minister. It is doing him no wrong for us who profess to be a Christian denomination to refuse to accept him as one of our body. If we are not a Christian body, it is time that the fact should be known. But we are a Christian denomination. All our antecedents and all our professions attest the fact. Men like Mr. Abbot, and others that we have named, who, in ceasing to be Christian believers, have voluntarily separated themselves from us, and would think it wrong to themselves to be claimed by us, bear witness to the fact that we are a Christian denomination. Can we not regulate our internal policy in such a way as to recognize this same fact among ourselves, and bring our whole organized action into conformity with it? Either we must do this or perish. A house divided against itself cannot stand.

Free Religion is one thing. Free Christianity is another. They who have gone out from us understand this perfectly well. Until we understand it, we shall have no substantial comfort or peace, and not a hundredth part of the prosperity and inward and outward success which of right belong to those who accept the life and teachings of Jesus in a brotherhood which claims no mastership over others; because one is their Master, even Christ.

We have dwelt principally upon one of the subjects brought forward by our correspondent. But it lies at the foundation of all our difficulties. He will probably assent to what we have said, even to the qualifications that we have suggested in regard to some of his statements. We should be glad to say a few things more if there were space and the weather while we write were less exhausting.

We believe in all the great religions of the world as containing each some elements of divine truth revealed by God for the good of his children. But above them all, and beyond them all, we believe in Christ as the wisdom of God and the power of God unto salvation. And we believe in the fundamental doctrines of Christianity as interpreted by Unitarians. But we are not sure that their philosophy has been

broad enough and deep enough to take in the whole range of divine truth. In the principles of our religion, as revealed to us in Jesus, we believe that there is room for the evolution of truths adapted to the advancing of the human mind and of society for all coming times. Man's interpretations pass away, but Christ's words remain, unfolding ever-deepening truths and renewed energies as the world advances in thought and life. This progress even to the infinite is an essential characteristic of our religion, and makes it eternal. Woe to the churches which substitute their creeds of to-day for the divine Word, and thus vainly strive to stay the progress of God's kingdom. We are borne on in the development of his truth. Our liberty exposes us to dangers peculiar to our position. But we would not on that account renounce it. "Unitarianism," so far as it is a human interpretation of Christ's gospel, "is still an open question." We deny the doctrine of the trinity, and hold strictly to the unity of God; but much of the philosophy by which our predecessors explained and defended this doctrine was unsubstantial, and is already vanishing away. We believe in the vital, central doctrines of Unitarianism; but, with increasing knowledge, we begin to see in some directions farther even than Channing. While we hold with him that the Father is the one and only God, we see in the relation of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit to one another and to us a richer, warmer, profounder meaning than we find recognized in the writings of that great and almost inspired teacher of spiritual things. While there is progress there must be open questions, if not in regard to the truth of central doctrines, yet in regard to the depth and richness of their meaning, and especially in their practical bearings upon the thought and action of the times. There are those who, holding with Channing to the strict unity of God, and controlled by the scientific spirit of the age, renounce Christianity as he believed in it, and accept only the teachings of a materialistic science. They, of course, though in one sense his followers, would not be recognized by him as Christians. Among those who accept his views there are others who, in the light of a profounder philosophy

reaching through the realm of mind as well as of matter, find in Christianity itself—it words, its miracles, its great and holy life—an enlargement of view, an influx of divine life, which he, if he had lived in these days, would also have found and rejoiced in with an infinite joy.

But progress, in its foremost advances, is only for the few. Our correspondent's idea of success as the test of ability may apply in merchandise and war, but not to the leaders in any great movement onward for the moral and spiritual elevation of the race. "Many are called, but few are chosen," must be forever true in regard to those who are foremost in any such enterprise. While we stop to popularize our doctrine and adapt it to the wants of the day, we fall behind in our search after truth. The pioneers in what is highest and best will always be few. One class prepares the ground and sows the seed, another and far more numerous class enter into their labors. And very often those who enter into fields prepared for them bear entirely a different name from those who have labored before them.

As propagandists, organized into a sect, we have not been eminently successful. Our ablest men have been scholars and thinkers rather than men of practical skill and sagacity. The wisest men in our body have not been its leaders in practical matters, and have sometimes gone away from its public meetings with feelings of sadness, if not of disgust. It is one of the infelicities of a thoughtful and studious life that it makes a man too sensitive and critical to engage successfully in the details of practical affairs. Hence, at our annual business meetings, most of the time is taken up by a few familiar voices, and people, however pleased for the moment, go away feeling that they have not been enlightened by the ripest and richest wisdom of the denomination. Still, there is a great deal of thought given to the administration of our denominational affairs. If the wisest men are not always heard at the annual business meeting of the Unitarian Association, they are heard at the meetings of the Board of Directors, and their action, we believe, has been marked by eminent fidelity and good judgment. They make mistakes, as



all men do. They may sometimes have employed unskillful agents, and sometimes, perhaps, unbelieving or even bad men to do their work. Impolitic measures may have been adopted. But these are the rare exceptions. On the whole, the best available measures have been adopted, and the best men that could be had have been employed. As we call to mind the Directors of the Association for a long series of years, we recognize with thankfulness the names of men in almost every walk of life, who have been distinguished for their integrity, their honor, and their practical sagacity in the management of affairs.

Still, we have not prospered as we ought to have done with such principles as we have had to promulgate, and "people believe in success."

"Oh, learn to scorn the praise of men!  
Oh, learn to lose with God!"

With all our faith in God, we must not allow ourselves to be enslaved to this doctrine of success. The highest success is often invisible. The ministry which does most for the life of the world may be that which has the smallest visible show of success. Our formal extension as a denomination is of less account than our action as an influence. We may really be doing the most to mould the religious thought and quicken the spiritual life of men when we seem to be doing the least. A metropolitan church in Washington, a Unitarian church in every large town in the United States, may or may not extend our faith, according to the character of the men who may occupy them. But if a great religious soul, full of faith and love and holy reverence, burning with the desire to make men better and draw them nearer to God, should be heard among us giving utterance to a more inspiring and life-giving word, there is an influence which goes into the uttermost parts of the earth, making life a richer boon to those who possess it. Sometimes in the silent page the living word is found, and young men are quickened and transformed by it into ministers of Christ, and the whole denomination in which they are and others besides are ani-

mated by a more liberal and heavenly spirit. These are ways in which we may act if only we have the quickening power.

"Our ministers have one policy, and our laymen a very different one. Many of our ministers are Spencerian, Darwinian, and Emersonian: our laymen are intensely practical." Here, we think, our correspondent is mistaken. The skeptical tendencies of the age, which draw half-educated minds away from their belief in a divine inspiration, reach into all classes and churches, and are shaking the foundations of every social, political, and ecclesiastical organization. Even the Roman Catholic Church is no security against them. In every parish that we know intimately, some of the most able and successful business men are infected by them, and it is through the influence of these laymen that ministers without faith in Christ get a hearing and a settlement in our parishes. We believe that the ministers of our denomination, certainly the more thoroughly educated among them, are more conservative in this respect than the people. In the county conference to which we belong we do not know of one minister who answers at all to the description of our correspondent. They do not believe that one system of philosophy "is as good as another if a man only thinks so," and they do believe, not only in religion, but in Christianity as an "authoritative revelation, in the church, in prayer, and in the ordinances." The belief of the many makes the dissent of the few conspicuous.

We trust, therefore, that our thoughtful, conscientious, believing Christian laymen — our correspondent among them — will stand in their lot firmly and faithfully to strengthen the feeble-minded, to prevent the settlement of unbelievers as ministers of the parishes to which they belong, to make their influence felt in the local and national conferences, and to enlighten with their wisdom the Unitarian Association. We shall be glad to receive further communications from him and them. If they could only act in this matter as men thoroughly in earnest, privately and publicly, we should be a most efficient denomination. Broad in our views, firm in our

convictions, with learning and social culture and moral influence on our side, we, in this age of doubt, might do for the belief of the Christian world a work which no other Christian denomination has it in its power to accomplish. We might at once defend the outposts of our religion and introduce into the secret heart and life its deepest truth and its holiest inspiration.

---

#### THE COMING OF CHRIST IN THE POWER OF HIS GOSPEL.

LORD Jesus, come ! for here  
Our path through wilds is laid,  
We watch as for the day-spring near,  
Amid the breaking shade.

Lord Jesus, come ! for still  
Vice shouts her maniac mirth,  
And famished thousands crave their fill,  
While teems the fruitful earth,

Lord Jesus, come ! for hosts  
Meet on the battle plain ;  
Here patriots mourn, the tyrant boasts,  
And tears are shed like rain.

Hark ! herald voices near  
Proclaim thy happier day ;  
Come, Lord, and our hosannas hear !  
We wait to strew thy way.

Come, as in days of old,  
With words of grace and power !  
Gather us all within thy fold,  
And never leave us more.

— *Harriet Martineau.*

## HUMAN BEAUTY.

BY WOODBURY M. FERNALD.

THE various forms of beauty with which our world is enriched have ever been a subject for profound admiration and gratitude. There are very few things which affect the mind more deeply. It is saying much for the Creator, much for his goodness, and for all the riches of his nature, that this one characteristic of the world is so prominent. What a world this would be, were there nothing beautiful for the eye to rest upon—nothing of harmony in the outline of its myriad forms, and nothing of the charm of color or of gracefulness! We do not stop to ask, generally, what all this beauty is; but when we reflect upon its vast variety, its presence everywhere throughout creation, and the powerful and subtle charm it has upon us, surely it must be that the Divine Spirit is represented by it in a most intimate and wonderful manner. And what multitudinous forms and essences of beauty must there be in the spiritual world, to give such affluent outbirth in the world of nature!

But it is only one department of beauty that we are to consider now. We might characterize our subject as *personal* beauty, were it not for the falsity which is frequently conveyed by the term, for it frequently pertains to the persons of men and women exclusively; but unless it is truly human, unless the person so distinguished be characterized by those inner and spiritual qualities which belong to a true and orderly humanity, then the beauty of the exterior is merely an effect, the cause of which must be looked for more remotely than in the immediate subject of contemplation.

The subject, from a true interior standpoint, is one of no ordinary import. And even outwardly, how vast and mighty are its bearings and its influence! What is there, indeed, that sways the heart of man more? True it is, that the religious principle is the strongest; and love is sometimes said to be the strongest; but divorce either religion or love from

beauty, and how is the whole subject, frequently, deprived of its power, and what a weakness has gone forth upon the passions and principles of men!

There is much here, undoubtedly, that is wrong, and pertains only to the merest externals of the matter, and has neither true religion nor love in it. But the truth is, at the same time, that we do not dwell in mere abstract qualities: the mind always imagines some form of divine and spiritual things, however much, in theory, that form is denied. And when men think of the glory and grandeur of God, or when they roam, in imagination, over the magnificence of eternity, and contemplate the high things of heaven, or the deep things of hell, there is always some visible presentation to the mind's eye, which serves to fix the impression, and give consistency and reality to the contemplation. An angel is as truly a something that can be formed, to the mind, with one person as with another; and, whether we speak of heavenly or human love, we know very well that the form which the object takes in the mind is one great secret of the presence of that object to the thoughts, and thence to the affections. To all, at least, it is a great aid. And why is it that the objects of highest adoration, the person of the Saviour, and the saints and angels, and other divine subjects, when they have been represented in sculpture and in painting, have had such an effect in the worship of the church? So evident it is, that even in religion, the distinct form of spiritual things, in all the shapes and colors with which they may be set forth in an embodiment of beauty, is a powerful and exhilarating principle in the human mind.

But in *human* beauty there is a peculiar charm. And where is the person who does not yield to it and acknowledge it? Both in a good and in an evil sense it operates. What is there, I had almost said, more strongly desired by those who are dead to interior things, than this witchery of outward beauty? And what a deceptive power is this which beauty wields! How many thousands are intoxicated and ruined by its influence, and strong minds laid low and humble at its feet! It is the charmer of the world. There is

nothing in music so thoroughly penetrative and seductive to the external mind, and no eloquence so effective and persuasive. There are millions who would forego wealth and dispense with fame for it; and even love itself, if it is not kindled at its altar, its fires frequently refuse to burn, for the one thing necessary to its life is not there to inspire it.

In all this, doubtless, there is much to be condemned. It is the external that the world is so taken with, while within, there is neither beauty, nor love, nor worth. This is proved from the fact that where two *souls* are attracted, where there is really a flow of magnetic elements that unite the *spirits* of the parties, love calls for no outward aids, but is established in the holy of holies, in the sanctuary of God, independent and in defiance of every external obstruction. This makes nothing against the fact, however, that were everything in order, as it is in heaven, — were it not for a state of sin and confusion, love and purity would always command an external of appropriate beauty, and be assisted by it. In the present state, beauty is sometimes a conductor of love, but it alone is not a retainer.

But that external — why is it there? How comes it endowed with such a power? These are questions we should do well to thoroughly consider. They pertain to our highest and best spiritual interests.

And first I would ask — who has not been struck with the astonishing incongruity between the external form and the internal character? Is there not something in every one which seems to say — this is a disorder; this is not what, in a true state of things, it should be? Every thoughtful person, at least, is struck with an ill-defined sense of impropriety, is unpleasantly affected by it; and if it were not for the frequency and commonness of the occurrence, the shock would be much greater than it is, at such a discrepancy between the outward and the inward. Why is it, we are tempted a thousand times to ask, that such angel qualities are wrapped up in such hideous forms? And why do we see, beneath the faces of the beautiful, such vileness and wickedness of character? Is there not something in the minds of

all of us that seems to say that beautiful persons ought to be good, and unbeautiful, disagreeable-looking persons ought to be unhandsome in character? Would not this be the more harmonious arrangement? Every one must feel this; and why is it, then, that there is so much of heaven in appearance, so much of the Creator's skill and art lavished upon the forms and countenances of the commonality, and even of the bad of this world, to make them very Apollos and Venuses in the sculpturing and coloring of human nature, while at the same time it would seem that the divine Artist had forsaken his work on the real saints and genuine excellence of mankind, so that the whole is comparatively a piece of unpleasantness and confusion?

Such are the questionings from a superficial view of the matter. But even here, it is not strictly true that such a prospect is presented. There is always a *something* visible in the countenances of the good, that is in harmony with their character. And, as a general rule, it may be said that there is a certain nobleness, and prepossessing exterior, on the better sort of people, and a decidedly piratical and fiendish look on the countenances of desperadoes and villains. In short, as a general rule, it may be said that the best of people always look the best; and we very seldom see the look of pirates and murderers upon the nobility of human nature.

Another fact may be noticed. In making the acquaintance of a very good person, with an unprepossessing exterior, we always, to a very great extent, come to forget the deformity of feature in the beauty of spirit that shines through. But what do we mean when we talk thus of the beauty of the spirit, and of such beauty shining through? Is it not plain here that the spirit has some form of its own? For what is it that gives the expression, that varies the countenance into a thousand forms and shades of goodness, sweetness, and love, if not the spirit, which alone possesses these qualities? And, also, should we see in distinct variation of form upon the countenance, the evils of a corrupt spirit—the disfigurings of anger, malice, pride and vanity, unless the spirit itself thus formally expressed itself? Who can notice the dreadful



forms which the evil passions assume in the very body of man, at the same time reflecting that the body itself has no life and no power of action at all, and not be convinced that within, in the very substance of the soul, there is the original power, the first absolute formation, of every quality of the heart?

That the spirit of man as well as his body is in the human form, is a truth not readily recognized by all, but yet is well accredited now by multitudes of believers. Indeed, it is only a false idea of the nature of spirit that has given credence to any other opinion. Because of the tendency of certain materialistic speculations, many have so persevered in their efforts at refinement as to deny all form and feature to spirit. But inasmuch as it is still recognized as substance, it must have *some* form; and the various revelations that we have, both of a scriptural and private nature, all concur in pronouncing the human spirit to be in the human form. The appearances of angels at different times, both under the Old and New Testament dispensations, were invariably recognized in the forms of humanity. They were sometimes identified as the same beings who had left this earth. Thus, in the appearance of Moses and Elias on the Mount of Transfiguration, and also the form of Jesus himself.

With this view of the human soul, it becomes more appreciable how both the beauty and the deformity of the spirit shine through to manifest perception. And we no sooner make the acquaintance of a good or evil person, than we come to forget, or fail to observe, the more material and fixed features with which they at first greeted us, and see more of that spiritual form which thus characterizes the soul.

The truth is, beauty itself is only the outward form of goodness, and deformity itself is only the outward expression of evil.

But why is it, then, that this beauty does not more universally and more harmoniously sit upon the faces of the good, and the corresponding deformity distinguish all the evil? The answer to this question is found in a profound truth of the law of human descent. The truth is, every man and

woman has two faces, a spiritual face and a natural face. The spirit itself being in the human form, the face of every spirit is a perfect representative and index of the character. And if it could appear, as it will in the spiritual world, unobstructed by the flesh, it would manifest the qualities of the spirit, whether good or evil. But the face of the body is derived from a fleshly parentage, and frequently manifests features which are totally at variance with the reigning spirit within. The spirit within can only form itself, in addition to the form impressed upon it by nature, by its own acts — by the disposition which it willfully cherishes, and habitually makes the reigning love of the soul. Thus it has power to make its own face, whether beautiful or deformed, and it will appear, when released from the body, especially when it has settled into its permanent character, in its own form according to its character. But the face of the body a man cannot alter much. He has some power over it, for it is a truth well recognized, that by long continuance in a certain course of conduct, even the countenance will visibly proclaim the change that has been going on within. Who does not recognize it in the face of the sensualist, in the miser's earthly and downcast look, the adulterer's leer, and the established expression of sincerity and honesty? But for the most part, the face of the body is a fixture of matter. Man cannot change and vary it as he can the more plastic spirit; and the features which he is thus obliged to wear are frequently no indication of the character that reigns within. There is indeed character there on that outward mask, and it may be a great deal of hereditary character; for these features, every one of them, were first formed by the spirit that so ultimated itself in matter. They are the product of a long ancestry. But the changes that the man himself has made in his character, whether improvements or otherwise, do not appear in the outward form as they are traced and fixed in the form of the spirit. And thus it may happen that the spirit itself is inexpressibly beautiful, while the body is disfigured by the laws of an hereditary and fleshly parentage. And so, also, it may be that the outward face, by the same law of transmission of physical forms, is wonder-

fully beautiful, while the inward, spiritual countenance is disfigured and deformed with every evil. "Look not on his countenance," saith the Lord to Samuel concerning Elijah, "or on the height of his stature ; because I have refused him : for the Lord seeth not as man seeth ; for man looketh on the outward appearance, but the Lord looketh on the heart." Ah ! how true it is that the beauty of the world lieth covered. And what is all this ambition for, as it reigns among the young and old of both sexes, to be thought beautiful ? Let us not be hypocritical or rigid here ; it is a laudable ambition, if it be connected with character. It is laudable as a matter of pure art, to present a handsome picture. If it were not for the pride and vanity connected with it, I should say to all the young, Go in for it, and make yourselves look as beautiful as you can. There is, at least, a pure, esthetical culture in it, and it may lead to refinement in everything. This is nothing to be ashamed of, or to be squeamish about. Indeed, there is a great deal of heaven in it. And Nature, I think, generally, in these human operations, knows well what she is about. But there is an old proverb, " Handsome is that handsome does." There is a great deal of interior truth in it. This doing of beautiful things does in reality form the spirit into beauty ; for it is the acting out of the principles of goodness and truth into works, that ultimates the finer substances of the soul into the form of their own goodness. We are no seer nor prophet ; but we confess a wonderful aptitude to such professions of seership as the following. " Goodness and charity," says Swedenborg, speaking of the other life, " is what forms, and makes a resemblance of itself, and causes the delightful and beautiful of charity to shine forth from the minutest parts of the face, so that they themselves are forms of charity. They have been seen by some and excited astonishment. The form of charity, which is seen to the life in heaven, is such that the whole angel, especially the face, is as it were charity ; which form, when it is beheld, is ineffable beauty, affecting with charity the very inmosts of the mind."

From hence may be perceived the whole foundation of the

principle and the passion of human beauty. The desire for it may be most noble. It is, when truly existing, simply a desire for an external corresponding to the internal. It is not all vanity — this aptitude of many persons to view themselves in the glass. There is, quite commonly, a nobler motive in it. It is not the mere external features of the face that are viewed. We look into mirrors, frequently, to perceive our states. And it is, much more frequently than is supposed, a tell-tale view of the changes that are going on within. Frequently, indeed, the internal is not thought of; nevertheless, speaking generally, the whole secret whereby beauty so affects us is that it is the outward form of the principle of goodness.

But why, then, does it so affect the vicious and depraved? It does not, with the same degree of power. The beauty which they love is of a lower and grosser order. An evil man, I apprehend, would find something in the divine form of an angel of the archangelic heaven which would be very repulsive to him. He could not approach, even to look upon its purity, with intentive gaze. Upon the same principle, it is not the sacred and holier pieces of statuary or painting that such a man seeks out first to admire the beauty of, but something grosser and more sensual; and if the evil are frequently taken with the beautiful in art or nature, it is chiefly for the external only: they do not connect with it the corresponding qualities of goodness; they do not think of it as suggestive of goodness or purity at all, except so far as they have in themselves some remains of these heavenly qualities; and it is frequently, we all know, only an evil love which the external of beauty inflames within them. Thus they pervert and debase this very principle of heaven. And even the lower and grosser beauty which they are apt to admire, they admire it frequently only on the external, while the instant it enters into their heart, it is perverted to the love of evil.

But oh! how high the flame, how pure, and angelic, and lovely is that wonder of celestial admiration which affects the heart of the regenerated man, as he beholds the divine beauties of heaven! He sees the form of it as the form of im-

maculate purity. He knows that it is only goodness divested of every evil that can give such form. And as he gazes upon the seraphic and cherubic glories of those heavenly beings, with holiness in all their looks, with loveliness, and humiliation, and innocence, and adoration, and spotless garments of truth and purity, how truly he may feel in his soul that the beauty of the Lord our God is upon them because it is within them! That is worship in the beauty of holiness. That is a scene which no eye of impurity can approach to look upon, for it is of heaven only, where nothing can enter that in anywise defileth, that worketh abomination, or that maketh a lie.

But let us now inquire still further, and more practically, into this philosophy of human forms. We say, the form is truly beautiful only because it is good; and though the connection is not fully recognized by persons in general, yet it is partly, and felt strongly; and that is the only secret of its great power in the world. And the truth is, too, we are actually forming our souls—shaping their very substance into beauty or deformity, according as we do or do not act out the nobler and diviner qualities of our nature. This may be seen even in the marks which human life is leaving upon the outward form. See how the protracted experience of this life fixes its impress upon the features of every one; how, sometimes, the lines and lineaments of the countenance will reveal, even to a stranger, the predominating influence through which one has passed; how the airy features of joy, the deep lines of sadness, the withering marks of misfortune, disappointment, and hope deferred, the contracted visage of habitual deceit, or the open *contour* of generosity and benevolence and nobleness, all are cut, by an infallible sculpture, in the face and form of the subject of them. Now, precisely so it is with the spirit, in reference to all the experience of the manifold life of the world. The outward form indeed, generally speaking, is but the expression and moulding of the interior form. By the hereditary and the actual, it is the spirit that does all. And each passion leaves the deep tracery of its working, each fine feeling the delicate imprint of its passage over the soul, each thought the lines of its

engraving. If, now, we had a microscope to look upon the spirit, we might see, in distinctness, all the fine engraving, sculpturing and coloring of this life. But ah! the angels do see this.

There is a story of a sculptor who received a visit in his studio from an interested observer, who, after admiring the almost finished production which stood before him in marble dignity, left the artist, and after an absence of some considerable time, returned to take another view of the work which had so interested him. "Why," said he, "you have done nothing to it since I last saw it." "Oh, yes," said the artist, "I have softened this feature, and brought out that; I have given a greater prominence to this muscle, and a less to that." "But these are trifles," said the visitor. "Yes," rejoined the artist, "but a great many of them make perfection, and perfection itself is no trifle."

Just so it is with regard to the spirit of man, which is no less a solid and substantial structure than the marble form of the artist, and which is wrought upon through long years by the great artist, Human Experience, where every enterprise in which we have engaged, every pursuit and calling of our lives, every disposition and affection with which we have followed those pursuits, especially the predominating principle which we have suffered to characterize us, becomes wrought into the form and texture of its spiritual organism, and will appear in feature, color, shade, in beauty or deformity, in the world to which we are all inevitably traveling. There we shall stand revealed to the eyes of all who will look upon us; revealed to ourselves; not as the natural man who beholdeth his outward face in a glass, and goeth his way, and straightway forgetteth what manner of man he was; but as an inhabitant of eternity, with whom the book of life is all unrolled, and the spirit is, finally, both inwardly and outwardly, the fixed, enduring form of its own good or evil.

To all lovers of beauty and worshipers at its shrine, what an incentive to such an ambition is here! In such a light the whole subject assumes a new importance. It becomes transfigured and immortal. It is not character alone, but the

outward expression and surroundings of it, which fire the soul with a true and laudable desire. What are all the riches of this world, or what would they be in a true and orderly condition, but the appropriate externals of a corresponding interior state? And so throughout the universe.

I once knew a woman of culture and refinement who frequently expressed an honest and ardent desire to be beautiful, even in the spiritual world. And why not? If heaven itself is enriched with all outward beauties, and if the very angels themselves are forms of charity and inexpressible loveliness; and more, if hell, by an internal cause, is compact with all spiritual deformity, I think that a true man or a true woman can desire nothing else than that the regenerated soul, with all its affections and thoughts, may appear in heaven in heaven's own glory. How much of truth, more than we have suspected, is there in many passages of the Scripture which speak of the beauty of holiness? And when this outward covering of flesh which enwraps the world shall be all torn off by death, what revelations will surprise us, as we see, in the countenances of our fellow-beings, the marks of every virtue and every evil for which they have been distinguished in the earth! There is many a beauty, far-famed and long-famed in the world of nature, who will have to part with it all in the spiritual world; and many a rude and disfigured countenance whose spirit will there shine in heavenly radiance, "as the stars forever and ever."

Thus it is that we have the whole secret — the whole philosophy of beauty and deformity. We seek not to carry it beyond this world by any forced or artificial theology. We only aim to look at it spiritually and internally. It is a mighty power. We bow to it, we worship it, we adore and idolize it. There is nothing so ministrative to human vanity, and nothing, frequently, so deceptive and ruinous. But there is a true beauty. It is the outward sign of an inward reality. Seldom, however, do we see it so in its fullness. It pertains, in its perfection, only to the spiritual of man, and to the glorified spirit after death. It is richer than any art, or any sculpturing and coloring of the outward world, and it is such as the angels of heaven are clothed in.



## TOPICS OF THE MONTH.

## MR. MOUNTFORD AND HIS ARTICLES.

WE wish to say a few words in regard to the able, earnest, conscientiously written articles which Mr. Mountford has furnished from time to time for this journal. For we think that the main purpose of those articles has been misunderstood by some of our readers. They seem to think that what Mr. Mountford would present to us as the only alternative is, that we must either believe in modern ghosts, demoniacs, table-tippings, and the other alleged facts of modern Spiritualism, or give up all that is miraculous in the Scriptures. And they say that if this is really the alternative, then they must give up the whole. We have read Mr. Mountford's articles with care before printing them, and have viewed them in a very different light from this. He is speaking of the philosophy which underlies all religious belief, and he says that the philosophy which throws Spiritualism outside the pale of human inquiry, as being in itself utterly incredible, no matter what evidence may be brought to sustain it, strikes at the foundation of our belief in all spiritual revelations and manifestations, even such as we find in the New Testament.

In this we believe that he is right. If, reasoning in the abstract, from the nature of things, we conclude that there can be no communication between us and spiritual beings now, then on precisely the same grounds we conclude that there never could have been any such communication. As respects their moral significance, and the evidence, external and internal, on which they rest, and by which our belief in them is determined, we by no means place the alleged facts of modern Spiritualism on the same level as the Christian miracles. We are speaking only of the *a priori* or philosophical assumption by which Spiritualism is cast aside without examination, because it is supposed to lay claim to a sort of communication with the spiritual world which is in itself utterly

incredible. We say that if from the nature of things such a communication is incredible now, it must for the same reason have been incredible always. And this is the consistent reasoning of those scientific men who deny the Christian miracles. They assume, for it is only an assumption, that in the nature of things all such communications are impossible or, at least, incredible, and therefore any alleged revelation from God, such as is related in the New Testament, must be rejected at once.

It is not strange that they who reject Christianity as a divine revelation should make this assumption. But that Christians should adopt it, striking as it does at the very heart of their belief, is a strange and suicidal course. And it is against this inconsistent and unreasonable mode of treating the subject by Christian writers that Mr. Mountford has been using all the force of his logic, the keenness of his wit, and the power of his genius.

Hume's sophistical assumption of the Incredibility of Miracles, because it is against all experience that a miracle should be true, but not against all experience that human testimony should be false, is virtually accepted by Christian writers as true in its application to all alleged miracles except those related in the Bible. But philosophical reasoning, and principles of abstract truth, know nothing about the Bible. If Hume's, or any other man's, abstract reasoning proves that a miracle is from its very nature incredible now, it proves that it has always been incredible, no less so two thousand years ago than it is to-day.

The question is not whether the phenomena of Spiritualism, as they are reported to us, are true — we care very little about them; but whether the philosophy which rejects them without investigation, as being in their very nature incredible, is the true philosophy. Is there within the reach of our human reason any just foundation for the *a priori* conclusion that it is a thing utterly incredible that man should under any circumstances have communication with an unseen spiritual world? This is the real question at issue in the discussions which Mr. Mountford has been carrying on with great ability

in this journal; and a more important question cannot be presented to the human mind. For in it is involved the possibility of any revelation from God to man.

We believe that reason, or the true philosophy, requires, both in spiritual and material things, that we should search after facts. In all our investigations the one object should be to ascertain what the real facts are. We must be wholly unprejudiced. Facts of a very novel or extraordinary character may require a much more careful investigation and a much greater amount of evidence to secure belief. But in each case the only aim we can have is to determine what is the fact.

In investigating the laws of the material world scientific men have learned to recognize this. Phenomena of a wonderful character, seemingly at variance with what had been inferred from all previous investigations, have sometimes confronted them. But what did they say? Did they reject them as incredible because inconsistent with their previous observations and generalizations? Not at all. They only applied themselves with all their faculties and their improved means of observation to find out whether they really were facts. And if so, then all their previous observations had to be reviewed in the light of these new facts, and their generalizations had to be so changed as to be in harmony with them. Again and again, in almost every branch of science, alleged facts, which in the light of previous investigations seemed to be incredible, have been thoroughly tested and then accepted, although they have worked almost a revolution in that particular branch of science.

We only ask that this same process shall be carried into every department of human inquiry. But when we apply it to spiritual things our material philosophers say, "No: that is all forbidden ground. Nothing can be learned there. It is of no consequence what you or any one else may say. Every report from that quarter is in its nature incredible." Galileo turned his glass towards the planet Venus, and asked the incredulous priests to see for themselves and believe. They looked and saw, but did not believe. "Your glass," they said, "does very well for earthly, but not for

heavenly objects. Like the priests of two centuries and a half ago, some scientific men of to-day refuse to believe in the results of their own methods when those methods are applied in other fields of inquiry. "Our methods," they say, "are perfect in their application to material, but not in their application to spiritual things." Why not? Facts, facts are what we want, in the realm of spirit not less than of matter. And how are we to get at facts except by searching for them with unprejudiced minds?

This superstition of men who claim to be philosophers against whatever is spiritual — this dogmatism of incredulity which plants its foot at the door that opens into a vast field of inquiry, and says, "Not one inch farther shall you go; that is all given over to illusion and falsehood" — is one of the most extraordinary spectacles of our day. It fixes a bar against all possible progress in that direction. And this all rests on the unwarranted and false assumption that there can be no communication between this world of living human souls and the living spirits which, for aught that we know, may be with us from day to day, our attendant friends and guardian angels.

We assume nothing in this matter. But as philosophical inquirers into the truth, we demand that others also shall assume nothing. This dogmatism is none the less unreasonable and hateful because it takes a scientific instead of a priestly name. We are not arguing for Spiritualism, but for a free, unbiased, philosophical search into the truth. We do not know whether what men call Spiritualism in our day is a branch of science resting upon fact or not, nor do we care very much about it. But the fundamental maxims which underlie all rational inquiries, by which alleged facts in the realm of matter and of mind alike are to be tried and judged, are of inestimable value to us, and we cannot allow them to be repudiated in order to furnish an easy method of overthrowing what many regard as a troublesome heresy. The unjust ruling of the court by which a real murderer is convicted and hanged to-day may be turned against the innocent to-morrow, and soon it may be that no man will be safe

because of that one unjust precedent when it has grown into a law.

Mr. Mountford is a believer in Spiritualism, and of course writes from his own point of view. In his articles, however, which we have published, he has not been dealing with the peculiarities of Spiritualism, but with principles of philosophy which apply to all religious investigations, and to phenomena which, whether facts or not, have been believed in more or less in all ages, by wise and great men, which are similar to some things recorded in the Scriptures, and which cannot be repudiated as in themselves utterly incredible without striking a blow at all revealed religion.

The above remarks have been called out by the following letter from Mr. Mountford to the publisher of this magazine. We ought to say that we print it without his revision or consent.

NAHANT, Aug. 8.

*My dear Sir:* I am sorry that you should have been troubled by anybody, as to your magazine, on my account. What I have written for it, during the last few months, has been as faithfully and laboriously executed as human weakness will admit of. And it is certainly not what I should have persevered in, but for the manner in which my efforts have been approved by six or seven of the foremost theologians of New England, outside of the Unitarian body.

As to Spiritualism, any utterance which I have made has been within the sphere of the Scriptures; as any one who reads his Bible ought to know. If because of my experience I happen to know what a demoniac is, and that he is what Christ said he was, am I blamable? And if I defend Paul for sincerity and intelligence in his exorcising "a woman with a spirit of Pytho," who is in fault? Surely it is not I, while I am attempting to affirm the truth of the gospel against revilers.

At present, in the Unitarian body, preacher and writer may deny the miracles of the Bible, and yet lose none of that popularity which gains them a hearing. And men can publicly proclaim that there has never any knowledge been had of a world to come by revelation through Jesus Christ; and they can deny that any angel was ever concerned with human affairs, and yet be counted as good Christian believers among Unitarians. Apparently a man may deny, in regard to the Scriptures, as much as he likes, and as

recklessly as he pleases ; while deep conviction is counted for an offense. If this be actually the state of things, the sooner it is known of publicly the better. Truth will be able to take care of itself ; and I, too, as to my connection with it, shall also be able to take care of myself.

I would say, that while I have been writing in the magazine it has always been with the understanding, on my part, that its pages were open to any writer competent to correct me, either as to logic or statement. And perhaps nobody has a right to demur against me at the publisher's, except for a reason, which he ought to be able to put into writing.

If there are one or two or more persons who conscientiously object to my writing, and if also they are gentlemen of education and intelligence, and of any considerable standing in the Unitarian body, I should be very glad to confer with them ; and if they will come to me at Nahant I will entertain them hospitably. Or, if they will write for me distinctly the points as to which they demur, and what the Scriptural texts are by which they would support themselves, I will either have an answer for them, simple and honest, or I will own myself to be wrong.

I have been writing because of my conscience, and as a duty.

What selfish end can any one who knows me suppose that I can possibly have had in view while I have been writing in your magazine ? For it is not the only literary channel which is open to me.

Some persons may think that I must have been having rare pleasure in gratifying two of my great hatreds. But then they would be persons who only partly know me. Though it is true that I do hate to see men make fools of themselves, and I do hate the recklessness with which some men are false to the Bible.

This letter you can show to anybody you please.

If myself I could please everybody and God also, I should be very glad ; but, as I cannot do that, I agree with Peter and the other apostles, and I say, along with them, "We ought to obey God rather than men."

I am, my dear sir, yours truly,

WILLIAM MOUNTFORD.

### WOMEN'S WORK.

#### WHAT A WOMAN SAYS ABOUT IT.

BELIEVING in the diversity as well as the equality of the sexes, I cannot doubt that their work is essentially different. Still, I am not blind nor deaf to the stubborn facts of women

often succeeding where men have failed, even in the counting-room, the factory, or the blacksmith's shop. The kernel of this hard nut, which so many men and women have tried to crack, seems to be, that if work is well done it is no matter who does it. But, in the everlasting fitness of things, there is work fitted for men and work fitted for women; and of the work best fitted for women is every variety of work that goes to make a happy and useful home. Girls have now all the advantages of education which formerly belonged exclusively to boys; but in gaining the privilege of acquiring all these higher forms of knowledge they have lost (for they are finite in their capacity, and cannot, like Lord Bacon, take "*all* knowledge to be their province") the home arts which are among the most valuable and most potent of their rights. How many men have been driven from a comfortless home because their wives could not cook, or teach another woman to cook, a good dinner or to make a wholesome loaf of bread? How many young men have been tempted to unfaithfulness to their employers because their wives' inability to cut out and sew the garments of a family prevented the small income from meeting at both ends, as it should be the pride and duty of the home partner to make it? And yet how many of these very women may have understood the dead languages and the higher mathematics better than their husbands! The best education is that which best prepares the pupil for the duties of life. Whether a girl is to be a wife and mother, or one of the much talked of seventy thousand single sisters, there is no situation for which she will not be better fitted by a knowledge of all the arts of home life. These ought thee to do, but not to leave the other undone, may be said of all the wisdom of the schools which young women now have offered to them. But I would not have their heads educated and their hands forgotten. We read in the newspapers distressing accounts of the starving seamstresses who are paid eight cents apiece for making a dozen of shirts. We try in vain for a sewing woman who can do a day's work without the overlooking of an experienced eye, and for indifferent work we pay at the rate of



twelve and a half cents an hour. Now, from these two facts it is plain that there is great want of good seamstresses, and abundant work and good pay when they are to be found. No class of workers, be they men or women, work at such extravagantly remunerative prices as good dressmakers, and this is because the supply of such workers is so insufficient. The remedy for want of work, and want of all the good which work brings, lies in the education of the hands; and no public school for girls should be supposed to do more than a small part of its duty if the hands are neglected. If the mind and manners are refined by studies of the highest order, so much greater is the danger of "the daughters of the people" who have their own living to earn. If hundreds have been driven by poverty to ruin, we are also told that many of them come from the numbers who have been so much educated in their intellect as to lose, or as never to have cultivated, the power and love of work with their hands. No woman who understands any branch of work required in a family ever needs to starve or be unhappy. Hundreds of happy homes would welcome them, and labor and refinement would unite to make life a daily blessing. The fields are white with the harvest, but it is women who must be the reapers. For, if they neglect these gardens which the Lord hath planted, who shall do the work there? E.

#### THE SCOTT CENTENNIAL.

The Centennial Anniversary of the birth of Sir Walter Scott was celebrated in many places on the 15th of August. Among the many notices called out by the occasion we have read nothing which more entirely accords with our views than an article in "The Nation," of Aug. 17, from which we are glad to copy large extracts into our columns.

"Scott is now somewhat faded, it is common to say; and undeniably it is true to say so. It was, of course, inevitable that such fame as his should fade. But it is as inevitable that no fading will ever deprive it wholly of its brightness, and that there will always be honor for this new creator of the art of story-telling, and affectionate esteem for this most manly of men. Unless we feel too

much of it, we of to-day can hardly feel at all our fathers' delighted and wondering admiration for this extraordinary genius. They had been reading dull romances, and he gave them, month after month, from his inexhaustible brain, stories which still, after we have listened to the countless multitude of the story-tellers whom he called into being, are a delight to old and young. They were absorbed in fierce discussions of fundamental problems of politics and of society itself, and he called them away and showed them, truly or falsely, — truly and falsely, we may say, — the beauty there was in the past which he so sincerely revered. And besides peopling the past for them with that wonderful throng of men and women, — queens, kings, captains, knights, churls and barons, priests, outlaws and statesmen, wizards, ghosts, lovers, — besides vivifying history for them, he educated their tastes also, and gave them higher views and a keener enjoyment both of nature and of art.

"It may be doubted if our children will not be paying him as much homage as we, and if nearly all of him that was perishable has not already fallen away, leaving him to stand as now for generations yet to come. The first poet of his time he will never be again. There may be, as there have been, disputes as to whether the divine gift was really his at all, and if his 'thumping metrical romances' merit the title of poems; but the boys, and the men, too, of 1971 will have better fortune than can well be hoped for them if, when next the great Scotchman's birthday is commemorated, they have found poetry more spirited, gallant, inspiring, pictorial, honest, and human than they may read where Lord Marmion beards the Douglas, and rides across the quivering drawbridge; or King James joins battle with Surrey; or Roderic's men start from the heather, and vanish again at the black chieftain's signal; or day sets 'on Norham's castled steep and Tweed's fair river;' or the stag makes his midnight lair in lone Benvoirlich; or the luckless page sings the boding song to her betrayer as they ride towards Flodden Field. We may venture to predict that to love this poetry will still, a hundred years from now, be an education in manliness as surely and truly as to love the Lady Elizabeth Howards of that day will be a liberal education.

"And so, also, of the novels. There will, doubtless, be many a story-teller to help the many there have already been to draw away a portion of the public over which Scott once reigned sole sovereign. But where will it be that our posterity, in the last quarter of the coming century, will have found their better story-teller? Will

it be some one whom we have with us now, or have had with us, who will be thought to have beaten the 'Antiquary'? Will 'Vanity Fair,' or 'Pickwick,' or 'Adam Bede,' be more read than 'Ivanhoe,' and 'The Heart of Mid-Lothian,' and 'The Bride of Lammermoor,' and 'Waverly,' and 'Old Mortality'? Will our grandchildren know Clive Newcome, and Becky Sharp, and Henry Esmond, and Mr. Pickwick, and Mr. Squeers better, and be the better for knowing them better, than they will know Dugald Dalgetty, and Dirck Hatterick, and Dominie Sampson, and Jeanie Deans, and Meg Merri-les, and Edie Ochiltree, and Monkbarns, and Rob Roy? Or will it be some novelist of their own? So far as we of to-day can judge, whatever they find in Scott's successors, as known to us, great as several of them have been, they will not find a work or a set of works which can ever balance that wonderful series of volumes which have held the last three generations captive; they will not find what will supersede that wonderful series of 'Scotch novels.' That is their appropriate name, no doubt; for though Rebecca and Rowena and Count Robert and King Louis and Charles and Richard and Saladin and Leicester and poor Amy Robsart and Elizabeth are immortal in his pages, and though we watch with him the combat beside the Syrian fountain, or thread the streets of Paris, or climb mountain-passes of Switzerland, or wander with Wayland Smith through English lanes, or take water with Raleigh on the Thames; nevertheless, of all the wide lands which we visit with him, and of all the men and women that people them, it is in Scotland and among his own countrymen and countrywomen that he is immeasurably best. Not only physically, but in all ways, he was strongest when on the heather; and it can hardly be but that the distinctively Scotch novels, from the deep tragedy of 'The Bride of Lammermoor' and 'St. Ronan's well' to the racy comedy of 'The Antiquary,' will suffice to give him permanence so long as the main thing in a novel is truthful delineation of widely interesting characters and captivating story. The humor, the strong sense, wide observation, the perfect sincerity and kindness of heart, the almost universal tolerance and justice, the comprehensive sympathy, the hearty relish of the wholesome good of life,—these qualities as shown in these books make it as certain as it is fortunate that they have in store for them a long immortality.

"It is, indeed, upon Scott's goodness as a man that a great part of the esteem in which he will be held as a poet and as a novelist will be based. Few men placed in a position of pre-eminence like

his have ever escaped with less of blame ; and, of such blame as he has had to bear with, the world is now disposed to withdraw much. We smile a little at the exaggerated loyalty which bent him to his knees before the Prince Regent ; we are sorry to smile when we hear of his reluctance that a baronet should be known to have written 'Waverly ;' and we are sad when we think of Abbotsford, with its Gothic mansion, its piper and the pibroch, the baronial state and the lavish hospitality which brought the great genius in his age to a poverty not too honorable, and brought him, too, the fatal opportunity for that splendid exercise of courage and determination which broke his mind and body and ended his life. But we are all now beginning to remember the merciful saying, or rather the just saying, that every man has the faults of his virtues, and that the Scott who built Abbotsford for himself and others is the Scott who built for us the fabric of mediæval society. He had his piper to play before him at dinner ; but what should we know of the wild Highlands had not the poet loved them and their ways, not only wisely and well, but too well also, and not with perfect wisdom?"

#### A CORRECTION BY DR. GANNETT.

We are very sorry that the following communication from Dr. Gannett was not published in the last number of our magazine. We more and more honor the liberal views and comprehensive plans of those who were our leading men forty and fifty years ago.

BOSTON, July 3, 1871.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE RELIGIOUS MAGAZINE:—

*Dear Sir:* In a notice of the last annual meeting of the American Unitarian Association in THE RELIGIOUS MAGAZINE for this month, on pages seventy-eight and seventy-nine, the writer cites Mr. Hale as having said that the Association "originated as a publishing body," and afterwards speaks himself of its having been "started with a limited purpose." As these statements are suited to convey a wrong impression, will you allow one who was familiar with the early history of the Association to correct them? The American Unitarian Association at its commencement announced, in the second article of its constitution, that its "objects shall be to diffuse the knowledge and promote the interests of pure Christianity throughout our country." Neither in this, nor in any other article, is there the least restriction in regard to the methods which might be used for securing those ends ; and no indication of meth-

ods was given, because it was the wish of the founders of the Association that they by whom its affairs might be managed should be at liberty to adopt every form of action that should seem feasible and judicious. One of the first attempts of the committee, of course, was to supply the want of cheap and sound religious tracts, and the publication of such tracts was continued from year to year, because they were in the direct line of the purpose of the Association; but they were not regarded as more than a partial expression of that purpose, and from the first other measures were brought into use, as, for example, the holding of public meetings, and the conducting of a somewhat wide correspondence. Indeed, what clearer proof could be furnished that in its original design the Association embraced the largest possible range of action than the fact that its present operations have required for their initiation or prosecution no change in the language which described its original objects?

It is but justice to those who are no longer here, to recognize the breadth of their purpose, however imperfectly it may have been realized in the measures which they were able to institute. G.

#### MR. JOHN PRENTISS.

We publish with pleasure the following communication from the oldest patriarch of all among Unitarian, or indeed American, publishers:—

*Dear Sir:* In THE RELIGIOUS MAGAZINE, for July, the proprietor, Mr. Bowles, has given some interesting reminiscences of a Unitarian publisher, he having been complimented on a late occasion as "the patriarch of the Unitarian publishers." Mr. Bowles says, "That year [1829] I bought of Mr. John Prentiss, of Keene, 'The Liberal Preacher,' and paid six hundred dollars for the subscription list."

Will you permit me to say that one object of getting up "The Liberal Preacher" was for Mr. Sullivan's benefit, as with a growing family I much feared his salary would not meet his expenses. I published it for several years, deducting from its income barely the expense of printing and distributing the work, paying over to him yearly all the profits,—some seven or eight hundred dollars. The six hundred dollars for the subscription list was a contract between the firm of Bowles & Dearborn and Mr. Sullivan, he receiving, with my full consent, all the avails. J. P.

## RANDOM READINGS.

BY E. H. SEARS.

## "POOR FRANCE."

POOR France is wonderfully rich in internal resources ; and, unless the statistics deceive, she will rise elastic from the depression of her misfortunes. Her territory is not so large as Texas. But according to the returns which we find condensed and compiled in "The Boston Post" she produced in 1868 more wheat than all the United States together. Our great northwestern and middle states are rich wheat-growing regions ; and yet in 1868 the United States produced only two hundred and forty million bushels, while France produced three hundred and fifty million — one hundred and ten million more than this great country of ours. The United States exported to England in that same year nine million dollars worth of wheat, while France exported eleven million dollars worth of butter to the same country — more than enough to spread all the bread which we furnished. In other grains, rye, oats, barley, France in 1860 was immensely ahead of us. We beat France in the two items of cotton and tobacco, but in nothing else. Leaving those out, France in exports exceeded the United States by more than two hundred million dollars. In France there is no right of primogeniture. The law rigidly divides all patrimonies among the children equally. There are more than three million farms of only ten acres each, while in Massachusetts the farms average one hundred acres, and at the west the average is still greater. This secures a higher culture in France, indeed turns the country into a fruitful paradise. Under a government which shall protect industry, and a system of education which shall develop intelligence and touch the torpid minds of the peasantry, France must rise to a higher state of prosperity than ever, wipe out her national debt, and see very soon the dawn of a glorious future. She has learned the folly of ambition for military fame and conquest, and the suicidal policy of keeping the people in ignorance to furnish material for mobs and insurrections. The lesson did not cost her more than it cost our nation to learn the evil and the guilt of the slave system. As both nations have been scourged into repentance, may they show forth works meet therefor, and in the new peace jubilee commence a new era of national glory.

## THE NEW STARS.

Two new poets have arisen — the creation of the new western civilization. Bret Hart we all know, who, with a large percentage of slang and profanity, mingles tenderness and delicacy of fancy and sentiment. Joaquin Miller, the other California prodigy, has not at this writing appeared in American costume. A year ago he went to London, passing by New York as "a great place for cheap books and a big den of small thieves," and published in London his "Songs of the Sierra," full of the inspiration (say the critics) of the fresh life of the Pacific coast. Jean Ingelow admires him. Rosetti thinks him America's greatest poet, Walt Whitman alone excepted. So let us hold our breath and be prepared for a new sensation.

## UNGALLANT CRITICISM.

Men who are public speakers and say many wise things and foolish things are exposed to all kinds of criticism. Ministers get used to it, and, unless very foolish, learn to take it coolly. The female orators will have to do the same. Somebody whose name is not given comes down upon them in the following strain, which, like all wholesale criticism, has some very just and some very unjust applications:—

"When Mrs. Blank her furious speech prolongs,  
And writhes two hours in oratoric pangs,  
I'd fain admit her claims to all her wrongs,  
If she would only spare me all harangues.

## A SECOND ADVENTIST INTERVIEWED.

*Among the New Hampshire Hills, Aug. 13.*

Why should we always attend church to hear our doctrines echoed back to us? Why should people draw off into groups and move always in grooves, each group getting wider and wider apart from every other group? To-day I took myself off as far as I could from the beaten paths and went to church away off in a nook among the hills. The people were wonderfully primitive. The old men looked like Rip Van Winkles who had waked up from a sleep of a hundred years. The church was Baptist. The preacher was a young man from the Newton Seminary, scholarly, Christian, and edifying in all the services. I went at noon into the Bible class and talked with these patriarchs. I told them I was a Unitarian



minister but they received me with entire hospitality and we had a very pleasant intercourse. Nearly all the congregation, old and young, were grouped in classes, and this was the "Sunday school." What new life and interest would be diffused through our Unitarian societies if they could be grouped in the same way! How these people talked of the Bible, quoted it and entered into the pith and spirit of it! But what specially interested me was my conversation with a "second advent" believer whom I fell in with before service commenced. There are a good many second advent people in these regions, and I had longed for some opportunity to meet one of them and get their standpoint. He was a grave, apostolic-looking man, with a white beard and mild features, who had read his Bible till he had it by heart, and evidently was imbued with an earnest piety.

S. I am glad to meet you. I have long wanted to know what second advent people really believe. Let me understand. Do you believe that Christ is coming again in the flesh?

A. Yes, sir, such was the promise. "This same Jesus who is taken up into heaven shall descend in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven."

S. But, my dear sir, how did he go into heaven? With flesh and blood?

A. Yes, sir, with the same body that rose from the dead.

S. But it might have been put off by a living process, after which he was invisible, and that was his ascension. "Flesh and blood," says Paul, "cannot inherit the kingdom of God."

A. Flesh and bones can, for so Christ appeared to Thomas.

S. That was before his ascension. Do you understand that he went up literally through the air?

A. Yes, sir.

S. Then he is in space somewhere overhead, and we might see him with a telescope. But go on, sir.

A. Well, don't you think if we asked Christ when he was coming again we would get an answer?

S. No, sir. He might not think such knowledge was most useful to us.

A. But I have tried it.

S. Well, did you get an answer?

A. Yes, sir: I saw that Daniel prayed and could tell the number of days, and I prayed and asked the Lord when he was coming. I slept sweetly and waked up about midnight. Then I heard a

voice. Somebody *hollered* and *hollered* away out in the lot, and by and by I heard distinctly the words, "*The angel of the Lord is coming.*" It came nearer and nearer. By and by the doors of the house flew open and the house was full of light, and a person walked in and spoke to me.

S. Did he tell you when the time is to be?

A. Yes, sir — 1873!

S. Are you sure you saw him?

A. Oh, yes: he sat down by the bed, took the Bible from the stand, explained passages I had been reading. Oh, I wish somebody had been there to see him!

S. Did he vanish suddenly?

A. Well, he disappeared again — but, sir, in 1873 the Lord Jesus Christ is coming again in the flesh.

S. What is he going to do here in the flesh?

A. Turn this earth into a paradise.

S. Well, there is no disputing what you have heard and seen. Only let me observe one thing: remember the Lord always fulfills his promises *in a higher sense than we take them*. He promised a Messiah to the Jews. They sank the promise into a lower sense and looked for a temporal prince, whereas he came as a spiritual Redeemer. So they missed him. Christ promised to come again. Believe it as firm as you will, and that he will come in 1873. Only bear in mind, if you look for him only in the flesh you may miss of him, and that he may be coming in a higher and better sense than that. Pray think of what I am telling you when 1873 comes round.

He looked a mild assent. It was an illustration of a fact which ever returns upon us, that a man may dwell upon one idea so exclusively and intently that it gets burned into him and possesses his whole being; and then it becomes "subjective-objective." He sees it out of himself.

#### "THE NATION" ON DR. CLARKE'S "TEN GREAT RELIGIONS."

The criticisms of "The Nation" are generally impartial, thorough and scholarly; but sometimes, under a show of great profundity, they run into shallow dogmatism, and demonstrate clearly that one man cannot know everything and should not pretend to. After commending Dr. Clarke's book for its fairness towards all religions, "The Nation" goes on to impeach its accuracy and show up mistakes such as all but a "profoundly versed scholar" would be

liable to, of course. Among these is his over credulous acceptance from a notoriously unsound authority like Pictet of the common Indo-European home as being "on the great plains east of the Caspian Sea." The primitive seat of the Aryan nations somewhere on the mountain plains of central Asia east of the Caspian Sea, is a theory which does not rest on the "unsound authority" of Pictet, but on the most thorough philological researches of modern scholarship, such as those of Bünsen and Max Müller. But the following criticism of "The Nation" is yet more remarkable: "Dr. Clarke," says the critic, "commits what we cannot but regard as one of the most fundamental errors of which the student of religions can be guilty, in portraying our original monotheism as lying beneath and behind the ancient polytheistic systems. This, to be sure, is also Max Müller's view; but it is one of Müller's characteristic weaknesses, and supported by arguments which will not bear a moment's examination."

Now it is a perfectly fair and open question, and one not to be disposed of by any slap-dash of this sort, whether an original monotheism was the ground of polytheism, and finally broke up into it. This view is not the "weakness" of Max Müller, but the view of some of the best and soundest of modern scholars, and is supported by not very obscure intimations in the oldest literature the world knows, both of Aryan and Semitic origin. It is intimated in the Rig Veda, as Max Müller has shown; it is found certainly in the oldest Hebrew writings; it is a tolerably fair inference from Hesiod, and so good a scholar as Dr. Ernst Curtius holds this opinion, and sets it forth in so fine a passage that we quote it for the sake of enriching our pages with it.

"The Pelasgi, like their equals among the branches of the Aryan family, the Persians and Germans, worshiped the supreme God without images or temples; spiritual edification, too, was provided for them by their natural high-altars, the lofty mountain-tops. The Supreme God was adored by them even without a name; for Zeus (*Deus*) merely means the heavens, the ether, the luminous abode of the Invisible; and when they wished to imply a nearer relation between him and mankind, they called him, as the author of all things living, Father-Zeus, Diptyros (Jupiter). This pure and chaste worship of the godlike Pelasgi is not only preserved as a pious tradition of antiquity, but in the midst of Greece, when it abounded with images and temples, there flamed, as of old, on the mountains the altars of Him who dwelleth not in temples made with hands. It is the element of primitive simplicity which always preserved itself longest and safest in the religions of antiquity. Thus

through all the centuries of Greek history, the Arcadian Zeus, formless, unapproachable, dwelt in sacred light over the oak-tops of the Lycæan mountain; and the boundaries of his domain were marked by every shadow within them growing pale. Long, too, the people retained a pious dread of representing the Divine Being under a fixed name or by symbols recognizable by the senses. For besides the altar of the "Unknown," whom Paul acknowledged as the living God, there stood here and there, in the towns, altars to the "pure," the "great," the "merciful" gods; and by far the greater number of the names of the Greek gods were originally mere epithets of the unknown deity.

This Pelasgian worship could not long survive in its purity. As the race split up into tribes and nations, the character of its religious feelings changed; the newly gained abodes were felt to stand in need of visible signs and pledges of divine grace, and the different phases of the Divine Being became themselves new divinities. Thus the consciousness of the divine existence branched off at the same time as the nationality of the people; and religious worship came to differ in its forms according to locality, attached itself to visible things, and then took the first step in the subsequent process of sensualization."—*History of Greece, Prof. Ward's Translation, Vol. I., pp. 61, 62.*

#### NOW I LAY ME DOWN TO SLEEP.

The following very touching lines have been set to sweetly plaintive music. The lines are by Miss Hattie A. Fox.

"Now I lay me down to sleep,"  
And the blue eyes, dark and deep,  
Let their snowy curtains down,  
Edged with golden fringes brown.  
"All day long the angels fair  
I've been watching over there:  
Heaven's not far—'tis just in sight;  
Now they're calling me,—Good night!  
Kiss me mother; do not weep—  
Now I lay me down to sleep."

Tangled ringlets all smooth now,  
Looped back from the waxen brow;  
Little hands so dimpled, white,  
Crossed together cold to-night.  
Where the mossy, daisied sod  
Brought sweet messages from God,  
Two pale lips with kisses pressed,  
There we left her to her rest,  
And the dews of evening weep  
Where we laid her down to sleep.